

4797. Also, petition of John Rice, secretary, Franklin Brewing Co. employees and 1,028 sundry residents of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4798. Also, petition of the Labor News and 1,834 sundry residents of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4799. By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of James P. Costello and 900 others, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4800. By Mr. Scanlon: Petition of Matthew Turner and 1,220 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4801. Also, petition of A. F. Utzig and 360 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4802. Also, petition of Pete Wasel and 2,000 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4803. Also, petition of John Dietz and 1,579 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4804. Also, petition of Harry F. Butzler and 1,920 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4805. Also, petition of Amelia Wyseier and 360 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4806. By Mrs. NORTON: Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the State of New Jersey, approved February 4, 1944, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4807. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as we come at the zenith of noontide glory lift our eyes from the mists and shadows which shroud the valleys to the hills of strength where Thy clear light illumines the rugged peaks.

Cleanse our hearts from secret faults that we may behold the spiritual splendor that only the pure in heart can see, lest our souls shrivel in small views and petty hates. In the eternal struggle of truth and error, tyranny and liberty, give us the assurance that we are not alone, we do not stand alone, we do not fight alone; but that Thy increasing purpose is bound up with all this human struggle toward the goal of man's redemption from ignorance, hunger, suffering, and chains.

Above the din of today's war to the death with forces of darkness, keep our spirits steadfast, our hearts courageous, our motives pure, as riding forth with knightly valor we bear in our hands the commission of ancient days: "He hath sent us to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of prisons to them that are bound; to proclaim the day of justice of our God." We ask it in the Name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 9, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 9, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1255. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission, and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939;

S. 1504. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; and

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 9, 1944, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1447. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR HOLMAN FROM COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER) laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. HOLMAN resigning as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
February 9, 1944.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee. I have submitted a similar notice of resignation to Senator NYE.

Sincerely yours,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Bailey	Hatch	Reynolds
Ball	Hawkes	Robertson
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smith
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Murdoch	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	Overton	Willis
George	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is detained on public matters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces on December 31, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification thereof, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period December 1, 1943, through January 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, together with a statement of certain major developments up to January 1, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ESTIMATES OF PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, by the National Housing Agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Security Agency covering various constituent organizations under that Agency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of pending legislation providing a wartime method of voting by members of the armed forces; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of the men's Bible class of the Parnassus Presbyterian Church, New Kensington, Pa., praying for participation by the United States in the establishment of a Christian world order and government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WALSH of New Jersey:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Board, and other Federal agencies and Federal officials, propose to recommend to the Congress plans that will involve the nationalization of unemployment insurance in the 51 States and jurisdictions of the United States; and

"Whereas transfer of these proper State functions to the Federal Government would

eliminate all consideration of local conditions of living and employment; and

"Whereas the balance in the New Jersey fund as of December 31, 1943, is \$308,026.821.30; and

"Whereas the proposal to federalize unemployment insurance systems of the various States seriously threatens the availability of this fund for use in the State of New Jersey alone, since the unified national system might involve pooling of all State funds; and

"Whereas the New Jersey Legislature by the enactment of chapter 386, pamphlet laws of 1941, directed that the Employment Service Division of the New Jersey Unemployment Compensation Commission, now loaned to the Federal Government for the emergency, be returned to State service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey considers that post-war problems may be properly administered only under a State employment security system including both unemployment compensation and employment service and, therefore respectfully urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to oppose the enactment of any proposal involving the transfer of the administration of unemployment compensation from the States to the Federal Government.

"2. The secretary of state be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of the joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Federal Social Security Board.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

"Approved February 4, 1944."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1712. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; and

S. 1713. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1714. A bill to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 1715. A bill for the relief of James A. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1716. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PEPPER submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CASE OF BENJAMIN E. COOK, ADMINISTRATOR, ETC., AGAINST THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted two amendments both in the nature of substitutes intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1535) to vest jurisdiction of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma in the case of Benjamin E. Cook, administrator of the estate of Cam C. Boyd, deceased, against the United States, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYMENT AND READJUSTMENT IN CIVILIAN LIFE OF RETURNING WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1617) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments submitted by the Senator from New York will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have just submitted, with the approval of the American Legion, an amendment to Senate bill 1617, the Legion's omnibus bill on Federal Government aid to veterans of the present war. My amendment is a substitute for title V of the bill, relating to veterans' employment service.

During the past few weeks I have had a number of discussions with representatives of the American Legion on this problem and in submitting today a substitute title V, I believe that we have worked out an arrangement which will provide a more effective veterans' employment service. This goes to the heart of the veterans' post-war problem.

The law creating the present United States Employment Service, which I sponsored over 10 years ago, provided for a veterans' employment service. The new provision I have submitted today provides for the establishment of a veterans' placement service board within the United States Employment Service, to consist of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as chairman, the Director of the National Selective Service System, and the administrative head of the United States Employment Service. This makes it absolutely clear that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs—General Hines—has an official relationship with the employment service. This board, of which General Hines will be chairman, would determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the veterans' employment service.

This arrangement will make it certain not only that the policies of the veterans' employment service are closely coordinated with the policies of the Veterans' Administration but will also make certain that the veterans' employment service will function as an integral part of the United States Employment Service. This is absolutely essential, not only in order to relieve General Hines from

the necessity of day-to-day supervision of administrative details, but also in order to make certain that all of the job-finding facilities of the entire United States Employment Service are made available to every veteran throughout the length and breadth of this land.

It should be recognized that the present United States Employment Service referred to in the bill has been operating on a Federal basis since Pearl Harbor, with employment-service offices in the several States. The new provision for veterans' employment service which I have submitted does not basically alter this wartime set-up. It is so framed as to leave open, for future congressional action, the decision as to whether the permanent United States Employment Service should be operated on a Federal or State-Federal basis. My own views on this issue favor the Federal plan, as written in Senate bill 1161, placing the full weight of the National Government behind the veterans' employment service, under a single chain of command, for maximum effectiveness in getting veterans reemployed on jobs in any part of the country.

HEARINGS BEFORE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE—REGULATION OF RATE BUREAUS

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use a consolidated edition of 1,000 copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress on the bill (S. 942) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for agreements between common carriers by railroad, between common carriers by pipe line, between common carriers by motor vehicle, between common carriers by water, and between freight forwarders, for the making and filing of rates, fares, charges, or classifications for transportation of passengers and property, and for other purposes.

DELLA M. BENDER—RECONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Tuesday last I reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate Resolution 234, to pay a gratuity to Della M. Bender, which was thereupon considered and agreed to. The action was taken under a misapprehension of the law. I ask that the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. Senate Resolution 234 to pay a gratuity to Della M. Bender.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to? The Chair hears none, and the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to is reconsidered and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

RESTORATION OF JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE—EDITORIALS FROM PORTLAND (OREG.) DAILY JOURNAL

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal relative to the restoration of the Jewish homeland in Palestine, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE RUSSIAN ATTITUDE—ARTICLE BY PAUL MALLON

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article under the headline "The Nation's politics," by Paul Mallon, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOSCOW AGREEMENTS—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the Moscow agreements, written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Star of February 10, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO WOODROW WILSON BY MARTIN AGRONSKY

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Woodrow Wilson, broadcast over the radio by Martin Agronsky on February 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT'S SPIRIT A LESSON TO WOUNDED SOLDIERS—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Roosevelt's Spirit Hailed," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of December 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD STAMP PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM NEW ORLEANS (LA.) TIMES-PICAYUNE

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Poor Substitute," published in the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of February 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL HOUSING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, some time before we adjourned at Christmas time an appropriation for housing came before the Senate. I called the attention of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] to communications I had received from my State and other States relative to additional housing construction. Those sending the communications felt additional housing was unnecessary, and asked me if the proposed housing legislation then before the Senate was necessary, and whether the appropriations were being made upon the basis of need. The Senator from Tennessee answered they were. Therefore the Senate supported the conference report submitted by the senior Senator from Tennessee as presented to the Senate.

At that time I told the Senator I had received several communications from my State and other States relative to unneeded housing. I wish to put in the RECORD a message I received this morning from the Florence Field Improvement Club, of Omaha, which calls forcefully to the attention of Senators, and especially of the senior Senator from Tennessee, the same situation I brought to his at-

tention on the former occasion when I asked for a congressional investigation. This is the message:

OMAHA, NEBR., February 8, 1944.
Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The members of the Florence Field Improvement Club respectfully request that Congress investigate the manner in which National Housing funds are being spent in Omaha. It is our belief that the principal gain from several of the projects now under way will be to the contractors, the real estate dealers, the finance companies, and the various agents involved, and that the war effort will benefit but little, and is an unnecessary waste of construction materials and manpower needed to help the war effort. It is our further belief that in the end the Government will have to make good the full 90 percent of the cost which it guarantees and that we, the taxpayers whose property is being damaged by shoddy construction, will finally have to foot the bill. This construction is not prompted by need, but by the desire of certain parties to get their hands into Federal Housing funds.

FLORENCE FIELD IMPROVEMENT CLUB,
A. C. DRACH, Chairman,
JOHN I. SMITH, Secretary.

I offer this as a constructive suggestion, and ask that the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations most seriously consider it. If housing is not needed, then appropriations should not be made. I should like to have the committee go into the matter in detail, because we in the Senate certainly do not want to be parties to appropriating funds when they are not needed, under the guise of furnishing housing that is unnecessary.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator, when any such matter comes before us, I shall be very glad to have him appear before the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

PHOSPHORUS SCARCITY AND THE MOBILE PLANT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, phosphorus is an essential of modern warfare. It is likewise an essential fertilizer if the land of this country is to continue to produce the foods needed for war and in peace. Due to meager production facilities, there is available for all agriculture purposes this year only one-third as much of this vital mineral as our soil requires. And if military requirements expand, even this wholly inadequate amount will be reduced. Admittedly, combat needs must come first. The protection of smoke screens must not be denied, nor the use of incendiary bombs limited by lack of material. The difficulty of estimating military requirements exactly is understood. But there is no difficulty about estimating agricultural needs, and there can be no dispute that there is a critical shortage of phosphorus for use on the land.

This is a subject about which I have been greatly concerned for the past year. In April of 1943 I addressed the Senate at length, pointing out this astonishing blind spot in our national program to increase the production of war-scarce foods. I reviewed the results obtained by more than 40,000 farmers in 29 States, representing every important

agricultural area of the country. These farmers had voluntarily entered into a program undertaken cooperatively between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the States. By adding phosphate to their soil these farmers had been able to alter their farm management so as to increase, not diminish, their land's fertility. And at the same time they had expanded their production of meat and eggs and dairy products, all war-scarce foods, without any additional manpower or machinery. I called it the substitution of land power for manpower. I deplored then, and I now deplore, the fact that among all the measures proposed to assist our farmers to more abundant production of needed foods, there was no recognition of the fundamental fact that the soil of our country is hungry for phosphate.

At that time I pointed out that the failure of the War Production Board to release critical materials to build a plant proposed for erection near Mobile, Ala., was only one indication of official blindness to what may be our major national problem, not only during war years but afterward. That plant was recommended for construction by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has perfected new methods and new and highly concentrated phosphatic fertilizers at its plant at Muscle Shoals and, pursuant to congressional authorization, has assumed national leadership in demonstrating their use to farmers. Part of the facilities at Muscle Shoals had already been diverted to the production of elemental phosphorus for combat uses. Agriculture's supply was being restricted, and military needs were mounting. To meet the situation, T. V. A. proposed to build a plant at Mobile to produce phosphorus for military purposes during the war and for fertilizer in time of peace. The extensive Florida phosphate-rock deposits would be tapped, and water transportation would guarantee cheap and highly concentrated fertilizers to the farmers of the Midwest as well as to farmers of the South.

The project was approved by the Congress, and money was appropriated 2 years ago. But ever since that date construction has been held up by the War Production Board. Now that it is generally understood that the shortage in materials needed for building has been relieved, there is no further excuse for inaction. Agriculture needs now, if the Army and Navy do not, the 50,000 tons of phosphorus which that plant could produce. Our land needs more phosphate—much more than we have the capacity to produce. The Mobile plant is only a small part of a needed program of expansion. Plants should be built in the West to tap the phosphate reserves lying there. The facilities of private industry should be expanded way beyond the minor increases approved by W. P. B. in recent months. The Mobile plant is an immediate step, however. A site has been acquired; designs are ready. Work can go ahead at once. To increase the fertility of our soil for the future, to save manpower and machinery, while at the same time expanding food produc-

tion—these are the reasons why our production of phosphorus should be tripled and increasing amounts be made available for use on the land.

We should not tolerate the scarcity any longer or permit this ridiculously scant supply for agriculture to be jeopardized by the uncertainty of future military requirements. That we are beginning the third year of war without any substantial effort to remedy such a critical situation is inexcusable.

Last July I introduced a resolution (S. Res. 172) authorizing an investigation of the problem. Since that time there has been increasing recognition of the importance of phosphate. On October 27, a special committee of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities made a report which has recently become available. The report fully sustains and confirms the facts and conclusions I have given. I am offering it for printing in the RECORD so that all Senators may know what this group of independent and disinterested scientists concluded; and I am going to urge with all my power an immediate investigation by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, so that it can be determined why the weight of scientific opinion, the practical experience of more than 40,000 individual farms, and the recommendation of a responsible Government agency ratified by approval of the Congress have been disregarded. If failure to release materials for the plant at Mobile is due to indifference, that can be remedied. If it is due to the influence of that segment of the fertilizer industry which would sacrifice the soil's fertility to its own out-worn policies of marketing, that must be remedied. We have been patient too long.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the special committee on the preservation of phosphate resources and their national use printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE PRESERVATION OF PHOSPHATE RESOURCES AND THEIR NATIONAL USE FILED AT ANNUAL MEETING OF ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 27, 1943

Food, shelter, and clothing are elementary requirements of living. They are products of the soil. Their production represents a continuous drain on the fertility of the soil. Inasmuch as phosphorus is the key element in the conservation of soil fertility, the correct use of an adequate supply of phosphatic fertilizer is fundamental to national welfare. The scope of the problem of supply is broad. Indications are that at least 80 percent of the soils of the United States are now deficient in phosphorus. The problem is particularly critical at this time because of the demands placed upon American farmers to increase wartime food production despite the shortage of farm labor and farm machinery.

The importance of phosphatic fertilizer in increasing crop production, in improving the quality of both human and animal food-stuffs, in controlling soil erosion, and in making better farm practices possible are too well known to need elaboration in this report. Some of the most significant results obtained repeatedly on the 30,000 farms whose opera-

tors are participating in the test-demonstration program conducted by the land-grant colleges in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture and the Tennessee Valley Authority merit special attention.

The increases in crop production through the use of concentrated phosphatic fertilizers and adjusted farm management have been spectacular in many cases. Likewise, in the production of livestock, the results obtained through the use of phosphatic fertilizers on pastures have been highly significant. The reduction in growing acreage required per 1,000 pounds of livestock produced has been from 20 to 63 percent. A saving of about 30 percent in farm labor and a 35-percent increase in the production with the same amount of farm machinery has been recorded. Farm standards of living have been raised and farm incomes increased. Taken as a whole, the results obtained on the 30,000 farms participating in the test-demonstration program are of unsurpassed importance in reducing to a quantitative basis the benefits which can come from the intelligent use of phosphatic fertilizers in a system of correct farm management.

The results emphasize the need of a new approach to the whole problem of phosphate supply for agriculture. The situation is only confused by citing statistics of the sales of fertilizers as a measure of the agricultural need of phosphate. The quantity of phosphate necessary to maintain soil fertility, without which permanent agriculture is doomed, cannot be measured by the amount which the farmers have been able to buy under the unfavorable conditions which have prevailed in regard to supply and price.

On the test-demonstration farms mentioned above it has been shown that phosphate equivalent to 17 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre per year, in combination with lime, shall be used advantageously and economically under good farm management. If this rate of application were made on only the farms in the humid areas of the United States, the total requirement would be for 3,400,000 tons of P_2O_5 per year. The fertilizer industry claims to have a production capacity of somewhere between 1,500,000 and 1,700,000 tons per year, although actual production in 1943, when phosphate is so desperately needed, will be only about 1,100,000 tons.

It is obvious that a very great expansion of phosphatic fertilizer production is needed if soil fertility is to be maintained in this country, and if farmers are to have the opportunity to use what they can effectively use. And the expansion should be in the production of the concentrated phosphates which permit economy in packaging and distribution costs. At present less than one-fifth of the phosphatic fertilizer produced in this country is in the form of concentrated phosphate.

The war has created a new situation with respect to both nitrogen and phosphorus supply. Within the past 3 years several large plants have been constructed to produce ammonia and ammonium nitrate for munitions. Agricultural needs for nitrogen were given but scant consideration, and no provision was made for increasing the production of phosphatic fertilizer which agriculture would surely need. The Tennessee Valley Authority, however, obtained from Congress, 2 years ago, permission and funds to build a concentrated fertilizer plant at Mobile, Ala. The Mobile location was chosen because Florida rock phosphate could be used. The Tennessee deposits are very limited in comparison with those of Florida and of the Western States.

The Mobile plant has not been constructed because allotment of construction materials could not be obtained from the War Production Board. There was, so it was said, sufficient phosphorus production capacity available for war, and the fertilizer industry, so it said, had ample capacity for fertilizer needs.

Within the past few months the situation has radically changed again. The need of ammonium nitrate in munitions has decreased greatly and agriculture has fallen heir to a large supply of the material. And the war need for phosphorus for military use is suddenly discovered to be much greater than had been anticipated. New production must be had with all speed. There is now no time to put new phosphate smelting furnaces at Mobile, Ala. They must be put up adjacent to the existing furnaces which draw their raw rock phosphate supply from the Tennessee deposits which are relatively limited. These new furnaces are for war production, and if now needed must be built with all speed. They may be turned to production of fertilizers after the war, but if so will still leave the problem of an adequate supply of concentrated phosphatic fertilizer unsolved. The Mobile plant planned by the Tennessee Valley Authority will still be needed and so will several other plants for the production of concentrated fertilizer. It would be highly desirable that one or more of the new plants needed be built in the West, and a later section of the present report deals specifically with this project.

The problems of a greatly increased supply of phosphatic fertilizer become particularly important in view of the likelihood of a cheaper and more abundant supply of nitrogen for agriculture. Nitrogenous fertilizer is a powerful stimulant of plant growth. And an increased plant growth means an increased uptake of phosphorus and potash from the soil. One of the unfortunate aspects of fertilizer use has long been the fact that a nitrogenous fertilizer accelerates the depletion of the mineral elements of fertility from the soil. If, as a result of the ammonia plants built for war, agriculture is to have cheaper nitrogen, it is certain that this will be a curse rather than a blessing if provision is not made to supply also an abundance of cheap phosphatic fertilizer.

Your committee believes that the need of agriculture for phosphate should be measured by the amount necessary to maintain permanent agriculture, and that it is time to cease measuring need in terms of what the fertilizer industry is prepared to sell.

It appears to your committee that it is high time that the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities took an active part in the development and execution of a comprehensive plan to assure agriculture an abundant supply of phosphatic fertilizer in the all-out effort which must now be made for increased food production, and to assure agriculture in post-war years of a supply adequate to maintain soil fertility.

A PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERALLY OWNED FERTILIZER FACTORY USING WESTERN PHOSPHATE AND POTASH

The largest and richest of the deposits of natural rock phosphate in the United States lie in the Western States of Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana. Most of this phosphate is federally owned, some is held by the individual States, and some by private corporations or individuals.

Most of the phosphatic fertilizer used in agriculture in the United States is applied to lands east of the Mississippi River. The rock phosphate from which this fertilizer is produced is mined in Tennessee and in Florida. The deposits in these two States are the only ones of importance in the United States aside from the western deposits mentioned above. Florida is well located to supply phosphate to States on the Atlantic seaboard and Tennessee is well located to supply phosphate to the adjacent Southeastern States. As the States of the upper Mississippi Valley increase their demand for phosphate, as they must inevitably do, the supply must come either from Tennessee or from the West. The phosphate deposits of Tennessee are very small compared with those of Florida

and negligibly small when compared with those of the Western States. An increased demand on the Tennessee deposits will hasten the time, already not far distant, when the Tennessee deposits will be exhausted. In any long-range agricultural program, the western deposits must be called upon to supply the growing phosphate demand of the upper Mississippi Valley, and the sooner this is done the better.

All the commercially exploited potash deposits in the United States are likewise in the western part of the country, some of them on the public domain. At present, potash is being produced commercially at Carlsbad, N. Mex., at Searles Lake, Calif., and at Wendover, Utah. A small plant is being constructed near Salt Lake to utilize the alunite from the Marysvale district of Utah. More than 95 percent of the potash produced in these western operations is shipped to consumers in the eastern and southeastern parts of the United States.

The present proposal is that a federally owned and operated fertilizer plant be constructed in the West at a site somewhere in the region where the States of Wyoming, Utah, and Idaho meet. The construction of such a plant may have to be a post-war undertaking. As such it would fall naturally into the class of projects which the Federal Government is now planning to soften the shock of post-war adjustments in employment.

It does not appear that private industry is likely to undertake such an enterprise as herein proposed, at least not in the near future. The risk to capital would be too great and the opportunity for early profits too small to make the venture attractive. On the other hand, it is vitally important to agriculture that the western phosphate deposits be utilized and that the phosphate be made available to agriculture at a price which is not loaded with a large-profit item.

The products of the plant as now visualized would eventually be three in number, namely, a concentrated superphosphate, calcium metaphosphate, and potassium metaphosphate. All of these are fertilizers of high concentration, such as would lead themselves to shipment over longer distances than are permissible for the ordinary fertilizers now in common use.

The blast-furnace process would be used, inasmuch as cheap hydroelectric power is not at present available near enough to the phosphate fields of the West to permit use of the somewhat simpler electric-furnace process. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been studying means of improving this process for the past 10 years and has operated a small blast furnace over periods of many months. The T. V. A. probably has, today, the best information available in the world on the application of the blast furnace to phosphate smelting and the conversion of the phosphorus to concentrated phosphatic fertilizers of various sorts, including the three mentioned above. The processes for producing calcium metaphosphate and the potassium metaphosphate are T. V. A. developments.

If a blast-furnace plant were constructed, it would probably be prudent to produce only the concentrated superphosphate at first. The supplemental plants for the production of calcium metaphosphate and potassium metaphosphate would be relatively inexpensive additions to the initial plant.

Inasmuch as the T. V. A. has recently made an estimate as to the cost of a blast-furnace plant using western phosphate, a copy of the T. V. A. report¹ is hereto appended with permission from the organization. The cost

¹ Report 14, Part II, The Problem of Utilizing Phosphate From Deposits in the Western States: Possibility of Using the Blast Furnace Method. March 1943. Tennessee Valley Authority, Department of Chemical Engineering, Wilson Dam, Ala.

data used in the appended T. V. A. report are necessarily pre-war cost data. The costs shown in the estimate would be somewhat higher if adjusted to present conditions.

E. G. PETERSON,
Utah, Chairman,
R. M. GREEN,
Colorado,
E. J. IDDIGS,
Idaho,
H. A. CURTIS,
Missouri,
WILMON NEWELL,
Florida.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment which has been printed, which I now offer and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 17, after the word "to", it is proposed to insert the following: "domestic wool, sugar beets and sugarcane and."

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho permit action on another matter before he asks for action on his amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Before action is taken on the amendment I wish to say a word.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before we resume the consideration of the pending business there is a matter of privilege which I think ought to be disposed of. On yesterday the House returned to the Senate Senate bill 1285, and in its message insisted upon certain House amendments and asked for a conference. I ask that the message be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
February 9, 1944.

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendments numbered 9, 11, and 12 to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the places of their residence, and for other purposes; and

That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 3 to said bill and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. WORLEY, Mr. RANKIN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LECOMPT, and Mr. ELLSWORTH be the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist upon its disagreement to amendments of the House numbered 9, 11, and

12, that it insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the conference requested by the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object; of course, as all Senators know, the Senate elects conferees, but ordinarily, instead of going through that form, the chairman of a committee submits a list of Senators to be appointed conferees, and they are usually appointed by unanimous consent. The rule of the Senate is found in rule XXIV:

All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.

Mr. President, I will make a parliamentary inquiry. Under the rules of the Senate do not conferees have to be elected, unless action is taken by unanimous consent?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair that it is the subject of a proper motion that the Senate in the case presented insist upon its disagreement to the House amendments, and that the Chair appoint conferees. That would be a proper motion. That, in the opinion of the Chair, is subject to amendment—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky did not make that as a motion. He asked unanimous consent, and I am reserving the right to object.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Kentucky still can make the motion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, he can make the motion, but it has to be passed upon by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no question about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall state the reason why I take the position I do. We all know that there has been a very active fight over the measure in the Senate. As I understand, under the proposal made by the chairman of the committee, represented as he is at the moment by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], members of the subcommittee which handled the measure would be appointed conferees. The subcommittee is composed of four Senators who favor the Federal ballot plan and one who favors the other plan. The vote in the Senate was exceedingly close. I think the measure was passed by two or three votes—I have forgotten which.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken. The final vote was 45 to 51. The other vote was 46 to 40.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but when the test vote came the vote was 42 to 44, or 42 to 46, I have forgotten which.

Mr. BARKLEY. Forty-one to forty-five. But be that as it may—

Mr. McKELLAR. But that is an exceedingly small difference.

Mr. President, I think it is utterly unfair and unjust that we should send this bill to a conference with four conferees on one side and one on the other. For that reason it seems to me to be appropriate and proper that the Senate, before doing anything, should vote on the question. Action should not be taken by unanimous consent. I am unwilling to consent to the proposal, and I therefore object to action being taken by unanimous consent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, reserving the right to object myself in order to get the floor, I should like to say that we fought for 2 weeks in the Senate on the question of the soldiers' right to vote. The question was decided on a number of significant ballots, not by a large majority, "not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door," but it was enough to indicate the position of the Senate on the question. I should like to suggest to my dear friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee, that the Senate is entitled as a matter of absolute right to have conferees who represent the final action of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us look at the question as a matter of right. Is it possible, after the close vote we had in this body that the Senator thinks the conferees ought to be selected on the basis of four on one side and one on the other side?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I think they ought to represent the ultimate decision of the Senate, and I think that is the only theory of a conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Four to one?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have seen the Senator from Tennessee himself repeatedly recommend the appointment of conferees, not on the ground of seniority, but from among the Senators who have been engaged in the handling of a particular bill. In other words, the Senator always wants his own subcommittee when he is in charge of a bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, of course, and every other chairman wants the same thing.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. But not always.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator wants to have his cake and eat it, too.

Mr. McKELLAR. The three highest ranking members of the Appropriations Committee on the Democratic side and the two highest ranking on the Republican side are usually chosen. That is done by unanimous consent.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, Mr. President, of course; and that is the decent thing to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. No question is raised about it. But I desire to say that the Senator has never heard me ask unanimous consent that the conferees on a question be in the ratio of 4 to 1, and I challenge him or any other Senator to find any record which would show that I wanted to hog the whole thing. I am perfectly willing to have the 3 to 2 ratio now. I should be willing to grant unanimous consent, so far as I am concerned, if my friends on the other side would be willing to take 3 and give us 2. But when they want 4 to 1, that is going a little too far, and I do not think it is fair; I do not think it is just; I do not think it is in accordance with the sentiment of this body as expressed on numerous votes. For that reason, I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee has objected. Now I wish to enter a motion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Before entering the motion, let me make an observation. It has been the universal custom in the Senate, to which there has been no exception so far as I recall, that in the appointment of conferees on the part of the Senate the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees. In carrying out that authorization it has been the universal custom for the chairman of the committee handling the legislation to suggest to the Chair the names of the conferees. If that is now denied to the chairman of this committee, it will be a denial which has never been registered, so far as I recall, against any chairman of any Senate committee handling legislation.

Furthermore, it has been customary—not invariably the rule, but in nearly all cases it has been the rule—when a subcommittee has been appointed in a committee to deal with the subject of proposed legislation which finally passed the Senate, and upon which a conference is sought and obtained, to suggest to the Chair the appointment as conferees of the members of the subcommittee which handled the legislation and dealt with the subject in the full committee.

I can say to the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Louisiana, and to all other Senators, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], that it has been and is his purpose to suggest to the Presiding Officer that the members of the subcommittee which were appointed in the full committee be made the conferees on the part of the Senate in connection with this legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, please. I will give the names of the members of that subcommittee: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

That is not in the ratio of 4 to 1; it is 4 to 2, according to the votes cast in the Senate on the measure. But certainly no one can deny the propriety and the fairness of making the members of the subcommittee which was appointed in the full committee the conferees on this legislation.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield first to the Senator who first rose.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say a brief word about the situation. I think there are two practices or customs which confront each other and deny each other at this time. I think it has long been the practice, in the appointment of conference committees, to recognize the seniority of members serving upon the legislative committee. I think it is also true, and I think it is proper, that consideration should be given to the views of the Senate upon the legislation, as those views have been expressed by the votes cast in the Senate. Those two positions cannot be reconciled. The practice has been as I have indicated.

Mr. President, I think we should dispose of this matter. I think the conferees should be appointed today. I think the conferees should begin the task for which they are to be chosen. I cannot help pointing out, however, that the votes in the Senate upon the major issues of consequence were not in the ratio of 2 to 1. Those votes in the Senate were close—sometimes with a margin of only 3 or 4 votes between the prevailing side and the losing side.

If a committee of conference is to be appointed, and if the seniority rule is not to be followed in its full application, then I think there should be recognition of the closeness of the votes in this body. A conference committee composed of three Members from the prevailing side and two Members from the minority side, I think, would very much more fairly and completely represent the views of the Senate than to appoint the Senate conferees in the ratio of 4 to 2.

I appeal to the Senator from Kentucky to suggest that the conference committee be made up of a majority of three and a minority of two. If that is done—

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield first to the Senator from Tennessee, if the Senator from Maine has concluded.

Mr. WHITE. I think I have said all I regard to be pertinent. I have stated what I consider to be the proper rule, and I have hope that the Senator from Kentucky will feel that a 3-to-2 ratio in the membership of the conference committee will more fairly represent the collective judgment of the Senate than a 2-to-1 or a 4-to-2 ratio. I hope the

Senator from Kentucky will agree to have a 3-to-2 ratio on the conference committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee to bear with me for a moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the first place, the question which is really involved here is whether we are to make an exception in this case, and are to adopt a procedure which has not been adopted in any other case before the Senate. We would deny the Chair the right to appoint the members of the conference committee, and thereby would automatically deny to the chairman of the legislative committee which has handled the legislation the right which has been enjoyed from time immemorial by the chairman of every committee handling legislation, namely, the right to suggest the names of the conferees. It would also abrogate the practice of allowing the chairman of a committee to suggest the names of members of subcommittees which have been appointed within the committee. I think I can say, not as a prophet, but merely as a matter of common sense, that if we abrogate the practice in this case, that abrogation will rise to stare the chairman of every Senate committee in the face in the future when we are dealing with the right of a chairman to suggest the names of the conferees on a measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have promised to yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should simply like to remark in connection with what the Senator has said that if we override the right of the chairman to make the recommendation in this case, so far as I am concerned so long as I stay in the Senate no conferees will be appointed by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I agreed to yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I said "4 to 1." I wish to read the proposed conferees included in the unanimous-consent request: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is for the Federal voting bill; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is for the Federal voting bill; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who is for the Federal voting bill; the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is for the Federal voting bill; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is not here, but has just been married and is on his honeymoon. He will not be here, and there will be five members of the committee, four of whom will be for the Federal voting law, and only one, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], will be against it. That is the truth of the matter, and it cannot be denied. We all know the facts. We all congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on his good luck in getting married, and we are not going to bring him back here, and I am sure the committee and the

Senate have no intention of bringing the Senator from New Hampshire back here, away from his honeymoon, to serve on the conference committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, in that regard, of course, we all congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire upon his contemplated wedding, or, if it has already taken place, we congratulate him upon that. At whatever stage it now rests, I congratulate him. So far as I know, he has not indicated any desire to avoid service in the Senate because of his matrimonial venture. If he should indicate such a desire, and should make it officially known, of course the Chair would appoint some other Senator in his place, and the proportion would be the same.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that a day or two ago the Senator from New Hampshire notified me that he would be absent from the Senate for several days, and that he would be unable to serve on the conference committee. He suggested to me that the next ranking Republican member of the committee, who is the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], be named in his place.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had not received such information. However, that would still preserve the status quo, not only as to the committee, but as to the Senator from New Hampshire.

It seemed to me that what is asked is fair and reasonable. It has never been questioned before, even in cases in which all the conferees represented the views of the Senate and there was no Senator among the conferees who had voted against the measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know of any such case as that? I have never heard of it. Of course, I have not been here as long as has the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee came to Congress when I was in knee pants. [Laughter.] He came to the Senate at least 10 years before I became a Member of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator was down in the woods of Kentucky. I do not know what sort of breeches he wore, but he was a big boy then. [Laughter.]

Will the Senator yield to me for something serious?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me call attention to what the effect of this proposal would be. Of course, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] should be named as a member of the conference committee. The next Senator in seniority on the Committee on Privileges and Elections is the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. He has been a Member of the Senate longer than any of us. Why should he be turned down? Why

should the rules be violated to turn down **ED SMITH** when conferees are appointed?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. The next Senator in order of seniority on the Committee on Privileges and Elections is the Senator from Texas [Mr. **CONNALLY**]. Why should he be turned down? Why should he not be named as one of the conferees? The practice is uniform. I call on my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. **OVERTON**], who has suffered by that rule time and again in the Appropriations Committee. Time and again he has served on a subcommittee, but has not been named as one of the conferees.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that we ought to be fair. I intend to propose—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not yield for any proposal. I have the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. When the Senator nominates his ticket, I shall nominate another ticket. If the Senator will yield to me, I will read that ticket.

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment. I wish to reply to some of the suggestions which have been made before I yield any further.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to correct the statement of the Senator to the effect that he has never known the practice to be questioned that when the chairman of a committee suggested the names of conferees and suggested the members of a subcommittee the members of the subcommittee were appointed conferees. I have a very distinct recollection of that practice being questioned on the floor of the Senate. The order of seniority was always followed until recently. Many years ago, when I first came to the Senate and before the Senator from Kentucky was a Member of the Senate, the question was raised on the floor of the Senate, and the order of seniority was followed. We have not always followed it since then, but it was the almost invariable rule that seniority should be followed unless some Senator did not wish to serve as one of the conferees.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Let me finish my statement. That rule has been followed in practically all the committees of the Senate. The Senator from Kentucky says that he does not know of an instance of the practice being questioned. It certainly has been questioned in this body since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection let me remind the Senate that some years ago a bill was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. **GLASS**], who, as I recall, was chairman of the committee. The bill had to do with banking. The then Senator from Florida, Mr. Fletcher, was the ranking Democratic member of that committee. As was customary, the Sen-

ator from Virginia submitted a list of suggested conferees to the Chair when the matter of the appointment of conferees was under consideration. The list omitted the senior Senator from Florida, Mr. Fletcher, who was the ranking Democratic member of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He was chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. He was not appointed. As I now recall, the reason for that was that the Senator from Florida had not been active in connection with the legislation, and the Senator from Virginia had been very active. I think he was the author of the bill. In suggesting the names of conferees, he named those who had been active in connection with the bill, a majority of whom were in favor of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will recall that on that occasion Senator Fletcher, of Florida, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, had not opposed the bill, but he simply had not been active in connection with the bill, and the Senator from Virginia, who is now President pro tempore of the Senate, being in charge of the bill, exercising his right, as he considered it, submitted a suggested list of conferees. He suggested the names of members of the subcommittee, Senators who had been active in connection with the bill, and who had considered it. The Senator from Florida raised no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, I was mistaken in saying that Senator Fletcher of Florida was the ranking Democratic member. He was chairman of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And the Senator from Virginia was chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia, who handled the legislation, was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and when he suggested to the Chair the names of conferees he suggested the names of Senators who had been active in connection with the bill. The list did not include the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator contend that a subcommittee handling legislation ought to be able to name the conferees?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am talking about what happened.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is usually done by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHEELER. If that practice is to be followed in this body, we shall have nothing but chaos in the committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot agree to that.

In the appointment of subcommittees seniority is not always observed within the committee. It is not observed in the Appropriations Committee. It is not observed in any other committee. That is a matter which is subject to rules within the committee. I recall that when the O. P. A. legislation was under consideration former Senator Brown of Michigan

was appointed chairman of the subcommittee to handle that bill. When the committee had concluded its work and the bill had been passed by the Senate, in accordance with the custom he suggested as members of the conference committee the members of the subcommittee which had handled the bill, and they were appointed conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER and **Mr. TAFT** addressed the Chair.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the seniority rule has been violated on numerous occasions. When I had been a Member of the Senate for 16 months I was seventh in seniority on the Committee on Education and Labor. I was selected to be a member of the conference committee on the wages-and-hours bill, as my colleague the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. **BARKLEY**] may recall. The reason given for my appointment was because of my activity in respect to the passage of the bill and my knowledge of its contents. I think it a good rule for us to select Senators who have been actively engaged in the passage of a bill and who are thoroughly versed as to the contents of a bill. Aside from that, Mr. President, I am wondering if the Senate is now about to engage in a fight over an issue which has been settled by this body. It strikes me that whether a Senator is in favor of the majority or the minority side, he is duty bound to represent the Senate and to maintain the majority view of the Senate.

I propound this parliamentary inquiry to the Chair: Whether the conferees are for the minority or the majority side, should they not support the majority view of the Senate?

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Although the Chair knows of no rule governing the matter, it is the opinion of the present occupant of the Chair that the representatives of the Senate are presumed to represent the views of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have enough faith in the Members of this body to believe that whoever is appointed to represent the Senate in conference, such representatives or conferees will fight for the majority view of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make one observation in view of what the distinguished acting minority leader [Mr. **WHITE**] said a moment ago with respect to seniority, and also in reply to what other Senators have said in regard to seniority prevailing.

If five members of the conference committee were appointed according to seniority, there would be appointed the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. **GREEN**], the Senator from Texas [Mr. **CONNALLY**], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. **SMITH**] from the Democratic side, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. **AUSTIN**] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. **BRIDGES**] from the Republican side.

If the rule of seniority were followed there would be three members of the committee definitely opposed to the uniform Federal ballot, and two who are in favor of the uniform Federal ballot. It is all very well to say that the Senate conferees will represent the Senate in what the Senate has done. If that is the situation there is no reason for making any fight against the committee suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island. If the conferees are to represent the true sentiments which have been expressed by the majority of the Senate, in line with what my distinguished friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said, and will enter the conference and do yeoman service for what the majority of the Senate said should be done, there should be absolutely no reason for any controversy on the floor of the Senate at this moment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may be permitted to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will any Senator, of any persuasion of thought, say that the Senate is not entitled to have agents—and that is all the conferees are—who will well and truly, so far as they can, represent the opinion of the majority of the Senate as evidenced by its final action on this matter?

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator is absolutely correct. I am making the argument only from the standpoint of seniority, because the question was raised by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. If the rule of seniority is to be strictly followed in appointing conferees, the Senate, which is in favor of the uniform Federal ballot, will be sending to conference a minority of Members who are in favor of the Federal ballot, and a majority of members who are opposed to it. That does not seem to me to be in keeping with our votes in the Senate during the last 2 weeks.

I have the utmost respect for all my colleagues in the Senate. I have great respect for the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. SMITH], who is my chairman. I have great respect and affection for one of the most distinguished Members of this body, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. However, I do not believe it would be correct to say that their hearts are in this measure, and that they would go into the conference and fight for the majority view of the Senate. I do not believe they would. I may be mistaken about it. If I were a minority member of the conference committee I would be fighting for the best interests of the minority. That is what I would be put on the conference committee for.

I wish to cite to the Senator from Kentucky one example of what has happened in the Senate with respect to appointing subcommittees. My good friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] was appointed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, as chairman of a subcommittee having to do with one of the most important measures which has ever been before the

Senate, namely, the telegraph merger under the Federal Communications Act of 1934. On that subcommittee, in addition to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], were the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], from the Democratic side of the aisle, and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], from the Republican side of the aisle. We all remember the debates which were had on the bill, and the conferences held later with the House.

From the standpoint of seniority the Senator from Arizona was far down the line. From that angle he would not have been entitled to be on the committee at all; and yet the Senator from Montana, who now talks about seniority, appointed him a member of the subcommittee, and all the members of the subcommittee were appointed conferees to represent the Senate in connection with that important measure. Why did the Senator from Montana appoint those Senators? He did it, Mr. President, because they were familiar with the legislation. They were familiar with what had taken place in the committee, and the Senator from Montana knew it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a statement?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky further yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. Allow me to make a brief statement, and then I shall be through.

I have stated what has been done in the Senate. Members of the subcommittee were all appointed members of the conference committee.

Another very interesting bill, which was reported by the Judiciary Committee, was considered by the Senate during the first session of the present Congress. I refer to the bill providing for the appointment of official court reporters in the United States district courts. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] were appointed members of the subcommittee to consider the bill, and they were all appointed later as members of the conference committee.

The same situation occurred in the first session of the present Congress in connection with another very important measure; namely, the petroleum pipeline bill. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] were members of the subcommittee which handled that very important piece of legislation. The Senate saw fit to appoint those three Senators conferees.

No Senator wishes to be fairer than does the Senator from Illinois. All I want is a fair representation of the Senate on the conference committee. I do not care whether five or seven conferees are appointed. However, if we are to follow the rule of seniority those of us who feel seriously about the uniform Federal ballot—and we all know what an acrimonious struggle we have had here—will be in the minority on the conference. I do not believe any Senator wants to place us in the minority.

monious struggle we have had here—will be in the minority on the conference. I do not believe any Senator wants to place us in the minority.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. With reference to the legislation to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, I did appoint the subcommittee, and the members of that subcommittee were later appointed members of the conference committee. That action was taken because of the fact that so far as the Senate was concerned, there had been no contest in regard to the measure when it was under consideration. I think the Senate was practically unanimous in its action on that bill. However, I do not appoint conferees in the Interstate Commerce Committee. If objection is raised in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, I follow the seniority rule in suggesting the names of conferees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Senator ever have occasion to suggest conferees when there was an objection on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. WHEELER. I have never had a case in which there was objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course not.

Mr. WHEELER. But in the present instance an objection is made in a highly controversial case. It seems to me, regardless of whether seniority is observed, that there can be no justification for the appointment of six members in the ratio of 4 to 2.

The Senator has said that it would be satisfactory to appoint three from one side and two from the other. I have no interest in the matter one way or the other, but I think, in the interest of fairness, that what should be done is to appoint three from one side and two from the other. It is very foolish, in my judgment, to enter into a controversy on the floor of the Senate over this issue. It ought to be settled by appointing three from one side and two from the other. To do otherwise would not be justifiable. It would look rather bad. All the conferees, regardless of which side they represented on the floor of the Senate and which side they voted on, will have to support the Senate view in the conference until such time that they cannot come to an agreement, and bring the matter back to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding. Because of the remark of the Senator from Illinois referring to the Senator from Texas, I feel compelled to make a statement. The Senator from Illinois has done me the favor of interpreting my motives and my intentions about this matter. I do not want to be on the conference committee; I have no desire to be on the conference committee. I assume, however, that any conferee who is an honest man who goes on the conference committee is going to represent, to all reasonable extent, the views of the body that appoints him and the views in this case of the Senate. Any

other situation would be contrary to established parliamentary usage and the highest parliamentary ethics. If I represent a man in court, I represent him; I do not take a hand-out on the side from someone on the other side. But according to the views of the Senator from Illinois, we will never get any bill at all, because, if the Senate conferees are now instructed never to budge and the House conferees are instructed never to budge, certainly no agreement can be reached.

One thing, it seems to me, that Senators have overlooked is the original bill, which is what the conference will be about. The original bill was passed by the Senate when I was not here, and I was not interested in it. The original bill was representative of the views of the Senate at that time, but it is wholly different from what the Senate has done recently. My view, if I were a conferee—and I do not want to be a conferee, and I hope no one will put me on the list, because I do not want to go on the conference committee with the implication on the part of any Senator that I am going to misrepresent the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator—

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment; let me finish this statement. I do not want to go on the conference committee and have no desire to serve on it, but if I were a conferee and we reached a point where the difference was fundamental and serious and we could not agree, I would, if I had my way, come back to the Senate, report to the Senate, and ask for instructions from this body as to what I should do in that case.

It seems to me the very theory of conferences is that both sides should not stand out like stone walls, in which event there is no occasion to have a conference. I want to see some sort of soldier's bill enacted and in the committee I voted to report the Federal ballot bill, because I thought at that time it might meet objections that many Senators had to it and that I had to it, but transactions on the floor of the Senate afterward convinced me I could not consistently support it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I want to say this to my very dear friend the Senator from Texas: I am sure that nothing any Senator said was intended or should be interpreted as in any way impugning the legislative integrity of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois said that he assumed that I would go into the conference and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would go into it and would fight for our side.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Senator from Illinois meant that.

Mr. CONNALLY. He said it; I do not know whether he meant it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Texas will not insist—

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not mad about it. I am speaking of the lack of the Senator from Illinois to appreciate the ethics of the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope that the Senator from Texas will not insist upon his

unwillingness to serve because I think we have got this thing worked out.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should not want to serve under any circumstances unless it was by the practically "unanimous" action of the Senate. I do not propose to be put up here—

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe it will be "unanimous" if the Senator will permit me to say so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to serve. To tell the truth, I have some other engagements that I would much prefer to follow than to serve on the conference committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. After conferring with the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Maine—and I am willing to submit the matter to any other Senator who can now be reached—the suggestion has been made that the following be appointed conferees by "unanimous" consent.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will practice on that word a little he will get it right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will get it right; I always try to practice on any suggestion the Senator from Texas offers me.

As I was saying, the suggestion has been made that the following Senators be appointed conferees: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I think that the Senator from Texas under those circumstances ought to serve, and I am satisfied that such an arrangement will be satisfactory to both sides of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I express the very earnest hope that the Senator from Texas will serve under those circumstances.

Mr. CONNALLY. What I was about to say to the Senator from Kentucky a moment ago was that I did not propose that my good faith and my conceptions of ethics and my ideas of integrity of view should be tested by a vote. I do not want to serve if a single Senator objects.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would agree with the Senator about that, and if the Senator's good faith and his integrity were put to a vote in the Senate it would be endorsed "unanimously."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to say to my distinguished friend from Texas that the last thing in the world I even thought of was any implication impugning the motives or integrity of my friend from Texas. I have served with him 5 years in the Senate. I have gone to him frequently for advice and counsel; I have great respect for him; I know, as I said in my opening remarks, that he is one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate; I shall vote for him as a member of the conference committee, and I know the Senator will give real service to both sides in the case.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On account of the enthusiastic and overwhelming insistence of the Senator from Illinois, I might be prevailed upon. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I now renew—

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I want to say that I am very pleased to know that this controversy has been brought to so happy a termination. The conferees suggested by the Senator from Kentucky meet with my approval.

Mr. BARKLEY. I now renew my unanimous-consent request that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate and that the following conferees be appointed:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection, Mr. President, to that unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since the conferees operate under the unit rule, I will say that I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Hurry up, Mr. President, before some Senator objects.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky include in his motion the necessary preliminary motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I now make the request that the Senate insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the House of Representatives Numbered 9, 11, and 12. That the Senate insist upon its amendment to the amendment of the House Numbered 3, and agree to the conference requested by the House thereon; and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Presiding Officer.

That, I understand, is the necessary procedure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the conferees be appointed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the Senate the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to reply to a very remarkable argument made a while ago by the Senator from Kentucky—

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I understood I had the floor. I yielded to the Senator

from Kentucky only for the purpose of asking unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know that. I thought I had been recognized in my own right. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Some question was raised here about the ages of two Senators, I being one and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] the other. The Senator from Kentucky made the astounding statement that when I was in the House of Representatives a good many years ago, he was a boy in short breeches. I wish to read from the Congressional Directory the biographical sketch of the Senator. He was born in Graves County, Ky., November 24, 1877. I went to the House in 1911. Therefore, when my distinguished friend was wearing short breeches, he was just 34 years of age. I am utterly astounded that, though he came from Graves County, Ky., in the country, he should have been wearing short trousers—short breeches—at that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Short pants.

Mr. McKELLAR. Thirty-four years old, and wearing short breeches! The remarkable thing about it is that the very next year he was elected to the House of Representatives. I wonder whether he was in short breeches when he came to the House of Representatives in 1913.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield in that connection, I have never denied my age. It is in the directory, where everyone can see it. I have searched in vain to find in the directory the age of my very dear friend, the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I received hundreds of letters of congratulations and innumerable telegrams just a few days ago when I celebrated my birthday.

Mr. BARKLEY. How old was the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. Seventy-five years old, and the Senator is 9 years younger than I am.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move, therefore, to insert in the biographical section of the Congressional Directory the date of the birth of the Senator from Tennessee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Getting back to short pants, I merely wish to say that when I came to the House of Representatives in 1913 at the age of 34, I was in long pants, but the Senator from Tennessee has been trying to pull them off me or shorten them ever since. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have enjoyed the exchange of ideas this morning, and I thought perhaps it might be worth while to give the sentiments in relation to the soldiers' vote of a very distinguished citizen of my State, who is now serving on one of the great "battle wagons" of the Navy. He has written about sev-

eral subjects, but I shall quote his language regarding the vote question, because I think what we have done during 2 weeks of discussion has tended to cause the folks on the home front to become pretty well confused mentally as to the nature of the soldier-vote ballot and the significance of what the soldier thinks on this subject. I quote:

In the first place, from what I have observed, the men in the armed forces don't seem to care much whether Congress passes a soldier's voting law or not, but on the contrary, think that the furor that it has been causing in political circles is extremely funny. I actually question whether even if a Federal law is enacted the men in the armed forces will utilize the privilege of voting, simply because they have plenty of other important things to think about, and mainly their paramount desire is to get the war finished and get home.

I now quote his second suggestion:

Secondly, the mustering-out-pay bill is felt to be closely associated with the right of the soldiers to vote, that the impression the boys at the front have is that it is so much pap and a damn high price to pay for votes. The fellows who get out of this deal with a whole hide aren't going to ask for anything, and mainly want to know that those thousands whose lives are going to be ruined are taken care of.

Mr. President, I have received many letters along this line. This one came in this morning from this distinguished citizen, who, as I have said, is serving on one of the great "battle wagons" in the fleet.

I think many times we "miss the boat" here, and I think we probably have missed it a great deal during the discussion of the subject of soldiers' voting. Let us get the ballots out to the servicemen. I think there is more confusion on this subject than on any we have discussed in the Senate for months.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I have just a little amendment, which will take only about a minute. It is noncontroversial; and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has to leave the floor, and I want him to hear the amendment explained. Then the Senator may have his own time. Will that be all right?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, the clerk has already reported the amendment, which proposes, on page 10, line 17, after the word "to," to insert the words "domestic wool, sugar beets, sugarcane, and."

Mr. President, it was never the intention of the author of the bill, or of the committee, to bring within the prohibitions of the bill the sugar quotas, and words which we thought provided for that are already incorporated in the Bankhead bill, or, to be more exact, the committee amendment. However, since

the bill came out of committee some question has arisen as to whether the words in the committee amendment are sufficient to achieve the result which they were intended to accomplish, and in order to clear up any uncertainty the words provided in my amendment are now proposed.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Alabama, and the amendment is perfectly acceptable to him, and should not be controversial.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What about wool? I have never heard of a wool subsidy. This is the first mention I have heard that one is to be permitted.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. There is very little likelihood that wool comes within the prohibitions of the bill, because there is no wool subsidy. However, the Commodity Credit Corporation has been buying domestic wool, at ceiling prices, less certain handling charges, in order to protect the market. Some slight question was raised as to whether that might not be considered to be within the language of the committee amendment, and, in order to be absolutely certain, I have included wool.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. With regard to wool, may I ask the Senator whether the amendment would protect the large supply of domestic wool which is stored? As the Senator well recalls, in this country we have three categories of wool. We have foreign wool that is owned by the R. F. C., purchased through the War Production Board; we have other wool, which is held here for foreign governments; then we have the third category, a large supply of domestic wool which is being held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Is the Senator satisfied that his language would not compel the domestic wool to be thrown on the market as distress wool?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The language in the proposed amendment specifically exempts from the provisions of the Bankhead bill the entire wool-purchasing program, and while I do not think it is really essential, if it is necessary, it would enable the Commodity Credit Corporation, when in its judgment it should do so, to continue to purchase domestic wool—not the British wool—at ceiling prices, less handling charges.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Commodity Credit Corporation has not been purchasing foreign wool; it has been purchasing only domestic wool.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. It has been purchasing only domestic wool.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad the Senator from Idaho presented the language of his amendment in order to clarify the situation.

I should like to ask another question in regard to sugar. As the Senator knows, we have two payments made to sugar; one is the so-called benefit payment which is financed by the sugar industry itself at no cost to the Treasury, and then there is the incentive payment. Does the

Senator's amendment make it crystal clear that both these subsidies or payments would be continued?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I am perfectly satisfied that it does. I have discussed the matter with the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. As a matter of fact the language is largely his, and I am perfectly satisfied that it protects the sugar situation in its entirety.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The question asked by the Senator from Colorado was one I also intended to ask, regarding incentive payments. Does the Senator's amendment cover the freight and insurance subsidies on sugar?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Yes; I think so definitely. I took that matter up also with Dr. Hutson and have all the figures respecting it. I am perfectly certain it covers the matter referred to by the Senator. It exempts sugar and sugarcane completely from the prohibitions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The language in the Bankhead substitute is:

That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats—

And so forth. It strikes me that the word "domestic" would also refer to sugar.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. No; because the language of my amendment comes right after the word "to." I propose to insert "domestic wool, sugar beets, and sugarcane and", and the word "competitive" follows immediately. So that it would apply to foreign as well as to domestic sugar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say that in view of the explanations which the Senator has made to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado, if there were a record vote I should be very happy to vote for the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The statements made by the junior Senator from Idaho deal with matters which are familiar to me. I thought when we placed the provision in the bill authorizing, under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, benefits to the sugar growers, that it covered the entire situation. That was the intention of the author of the provision. My attention was called later to the fact that one of the three benefit payments might not be covered. I then suggested that an amendment be prepared which would wholly and adequately protect sugar in all the payments being made to it, and the Solicitor of the Department has prepared the language of the amendment which the Senator from Idaho has submitted. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama. As I understand, his bill, as reported, would protect all payments on sugar with the possible exception of incentive payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. And the amendment now offered by the Senator from Idaho protects the incentive payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have been so assured by the Solicitor of the Department who rules on the matter, so I am sure it is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, has the Senator from Idaho concluded his discussion?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Yes. Has the amendment been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; action has not yet been taken on the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to speak to the amendment, Mr. President. I shall not object to it, because I think there should be some subsidies, but I wish to point out the completely illogical nature of this kind of an exception. It is, of course, illogical to make exemptions, as is done by the bill in this language:

That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed and oil-seed meals.

There is no more reason why they should be excepted from the antisubsidy principle than beef or anything else. This exception will permit roll-back subsidies on domestic oil seed, it will permit roll-back subsidies on sugar, it will permit roll-back subsidies on wool when the pending amendment shall be adopted. It will permit any kind of subsidies—consumer subsidies or producer subsidies. The exception being made is simply an exception as to commodity, and certainly no one can oppose subsidies in principle if exceptions are going to be made with respect to oil seed and wool and sugar and anything else that Senators may suggest is of interest to their sections of the country.

The point I wish to make is that if we are going to permit subsidies we ought to permit certain kinds of subsidies in accordance with some kind of logical principle, and not simply by the exception of some particular commodity. I have no objection to the addition of this amendment to the bill, but certainly there is no logical reason that I can see for exempting one commodity if we are not going to permit subsidies in the case of other commodities.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency I had full understanding from the Senator from Alabama that the sugar-beet industry of the West, and also wool, were fully protected under the terms of this bill. I wish to take this opportunity of expressing myself as being in full agreement with the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho, and if there is any question about the language in the Bankhead bill as it was reported, I am very happy at this time that that language has been corrected by the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. May I offer the amendment and have it stated first?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, it is proposed to strike out all of line 23 after the colon, and all of lines 24 and 25, inclusive; also on page 10, lines 1 to 15 to the colon in line 19, and insert:

Provided further, That nothing herein shall apply to payments made to the shippers of commodities or others to cover the increased costs, resulting from the war emergency, in connection with the transportation of such commodities.

In order to secure the maximum necessary production of agricultural commodities in 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration shall, as soon as practicable after the passage of this act, list and announce such support prices as he finds necessary pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended. The War Food Administrator may exercise, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, the powers conferred on the Price Administrator by paragraph (e) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to buy and sell agricultural commodities, and if he announces the price at which he will buy such commodities for any specified crop or period of time, such announcement shall be deemed to establish a support price. He may from time to time announce additional support prices, or increase existing support prices. He shall list, and announce the confirmation and approval of, support prices already in effect for 1943 or 1944 production.

Whenever any support price has been announced, the Administrator shall maintain such price or cause such price to be maintained in all producers' markets throughout the United States (unless the support price is limited to particular marketing areas, in which case he shall maintain such price in such areas) either by causing actual purchases to be made by some agency of the United States Government, or by contracts with processors or distributors under which they obligate themselves to pay the support price, or otherwise. All departments and agencies of the Government shall cooperate to secure that result. No maximum price heretofore or hereafter established for any commodity shall be below the support price therefor so announced, or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942. In any case in which a support price for an agricultural commodity is announced and maintained, and a fixed maximum price is prescribed for the sale by processors and distributors of any article processed from such agricultural commodity, the War Food Administrator may direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay to the processor or distributor of any such article an amount per unit of the processed article (without relation to the profits of any particular processor or distributor) for the purpose of making the margin between the producer and the consumer less than it would otherwise be, by the amount of the payments made per unit by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation may accomplish the same purpose, when it purchases any agricultural commodity, by selling such commodity at a

loss to the processor to be used for the purpose of processing, without affecting the general market price at producers' markets for unprocessed commodity. No subsidy shall be paid on liquid milk unless in any particular area a support price is announced and maintained to the producers of milk within that area, in which case payments may be made to the distributors of milk within such area under the authority hereinbefore conferred, provided the margin in the price of milk between the producer and the consumer is thereafter less than it would otherwise be, by the amount per unit of the subsidy.

The total payments made to processors and distributors, plus all losses taken by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the provisions of the preceding paragraph, shall not exceed \$950,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Senators will find copies of my amendment on their desks. They will note that a change has been made in line 3, on page 1, after the word "line", to strike out "15" and insert "19."

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there are three clarifying amendments which I should like to have acted on at this time. They change no material provision in the bill. I ask that the first amendment be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out "October 13, 1943", and insert in lieu thereof "January 14, 1944."

Mr. BANKHEAD. The date of October 13, 1943, of course, has long since passed, and the amendment would bring the matter down to the current date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I offer another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "or maintain."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, which I offer and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "but winding up and liquidating such programs shall proceed after the date of enactment of this act, and shall be completed within a reasonable time not later than June 30, 1944," and insert in lieu thereof the following "but such programs shall be completed not later than June 30, 1944."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator explain what difference the amendment would make?

Mr. BANKHEAD. In the original bill it was required that the liquidation should begin January 1, promptly after the completion of the limitation. We propose to strike that out, and to leave

the same date for completion that was contained in the original bill, namely, June 30, 1944.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the language which is sought to be stricken, the liquidation would start immediately, and would have to be completed by June 30, 1944.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the proposed amendment, the liquidation will begin just as soon as the bill is enacted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not see how the Senator gets that understanding. The amendment proposes a liberalization, rather than a restriction.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was simply endeavoring to find out the difference.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The amendment refers to fixing the date for beginning liquidation. It simply provides that on June 30 it will end. That is all.

Mr. ELLENDER. And as the Senator stated yesterday, all programs which are now in force can be carried out to the same extent as they are now being carried out, until June 30, 1944.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama on page 10, lines 3 to 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has an amendment. He is not now in the Chamber at the moment. The amendment lies on the desk. I suppose we shall have an opportunity to take it up later.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I believe my amendment comes next in order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well, Mr. President; I do not insist on now taking up the Reed amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there has been question raised, and I have finally concluded that, in my amendment, the figure in line 3 should be "15", as it originally was, instead of "19", so as to make the language read: "To the colon in line 15." I therefore wish to delete the previous modification of my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to do so, and the modification will be deleted.

Mr. TAFT. Therefore, Mr. President, I am offering the amendment to the committee amendment exactly as it is printed and lies on the desks of Senators.

Mr. President, the demand for a billion and a half dollars of subsidies is based on the claim that by that means it will be possible to hold the line, absolutely fix prices, and fix wages. That is the only basis for the proposal. No one wants to pay subsidies. Everyone admits that, in general, subsidies are undesirable unless absolutely necessary; and the only justification for the all-out subsidy program is that by that means it will be possible to hold the line.

I suggest that the whole inflation problem is much more complicated than that, that there are many other ways by which we can hold the line or can hold down prices, and that there are many other things which should be done. This is only one feature of a very extensive program. I suggest that, as a matter

of fact, the hold-the-line theory is unsound, unwise, and impossible, and that therefore the whole basis for the general subsidy program is, it seems to me, unsound. I do not need to suggest the other things which bring about inflation.

The first remedy which is necessary is to reduce governmental expenditures as much as possible. Inflation is brought about only by the governmental deficit, and by no other cause. If it were not for the governmental deficit there would not be any difficulty. But there is a deficit. There has been some reduction of expense. The committee of which the able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman has brought about a reduction of governmental expenses. The War Department has to some extent been scaling down expenses in the war effort itself. But it seems to me to be obvious that expenditures can be further reduced, and that the war can be conducted, without any deterioration in the effort, in a less wasteful manner.

In the second place, we must increase taxes as much as possible. I regret that in the recent tax bill we did not increase them somewhat more; but the question whether taxes are to continue as they are today—\$42,000,000,000—or are to be \$5,000,000,000 more, after all, is not going to be the fundamental issue; because there is still a deficit of approximately \$50,000,000,000.

In the third place, there must be an effort to sell bonds to the people who have real savings, because to the extent that we can take savings which otherwise would be spent and can have them placed in Government bonds and into the hands of the Government, we help to check inflation. We must check as much as possible the sales of bonds to commercial banks, which create purchasing power out of thin air, and we must reduce the tremendous purchasing power which hammers on the walls of the price structure.

In the fourth place, we must control prices to a large extent by rationing. If we artificially cut down, by rationing, the demand for a certain commodity, certainly the demand upon that particular commodity can be removed. The rationing program is just as important a feature as is the subsidy program.

But, finally, with all of this we must have, under these conditions, price and wage control. No matter how we conduct our other policies, I do not believe we can eliminate a certain amount of inflation—that is to say, a certain increase of purchasing power—which will force prices up, particularly in view of the psychology of war, with constant rumors of shortages, even if the shortages do not actually exist.

So, Mr. President, from the beginning I proposed a price-control program and did so before the administration proposed it, and I proposed a wage-control program and did so before the administration proposed it. I think a continuation of those programs is necessary, but I do not think it is necessary to enforce them by a general subsidy program.

On the other hand, I think there are subsidies which are helpful. Subsidies

may be used in various ways. They may be used, as in the case of copper, to subsidize high-cost producers and to save money. I do not think that in the food field or in the agricultural field we can attempt to subsidize particular high-cost producers. The consequences of such a policy, I think, would be much worse than any advantages which could be derived from it.

However, in some instances, by a subsidy on one commodity we can perhaps save consumers a great deal more money than is spent for the subsidy. Take the case of the oil-seed subsidy. If by subsidizing soybeans and peanut oil we raise the prices paid to farmers for those commodities, but do not raise the prices paid for them by consumers, then we are not forced to go on and also raise the price of lard and the price of cottonseed oil and the prices of other fat products which the consumers buy. Consequently, with an expenditure of, let us say, \$20,000,000 for those two commodities, we can save consumers approximately \$80,000,000 on all oil and fat products. Therefore, I think there are subsidies which can result in some advantage.

We have heard reference to the spiral of prices and wages. Undoubtedly if wages rise somewhat, there is a pressure to raise prices; and if prices rise, there is a pressure to raise wages. But that is a very slow process. After all, wages are increased only once a year, as a rule. If by the use of subsidies we can slow up that process, if by temporary subsidies we can postpone the increase in prices, I think subsidies may very well be used.

It is only when we come to subsidies all across the board that I see no justification for such a policy, for if the Government pays \$100,000,000 in order to save the consumers \$100,000,000 I believe that is just about as inflationary as to let prices paid by consumers go up, for the reason that the Government has to borrow the \$100,000,000 and must borrow it from commercial banks, since we have largely exhausted individual savings, and thus the \$100,000,000 will be available to hammer further the line on price control. If we are going to support the subsidy program as a hold-the-line measure, then we shall have to hold the line completely. We shall have to prevent any increases in prices. If we are going to vote to do that, I believe the increase will cost in the neighborhood of \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 during the first year, if we are really going to hold the line, because the natural forces of increase are such that they are bound, I believe, to increase prices 5 or 6 percent in a year. Five or six percent means four or five billion dollars of subsidies which we shall have to pay if we are to try to hold the line.

I think the hold-the-line theory is wrong. It is a popular theory. It is supposedly advocated by the administration. The theory is that we absolutely freeze all prices and all wages where they are. There are two objections to that. In the first place, it freezes injustices, and the American people will not stand for injustices. It attempts to freeze sub-

standard wages. What did we do? We immediately enacted a wage law providing that substandard wages might be raised, because we recognized the justice of it.

The freezing of prices has resulted in many small businessmen being put out of business. Small packers in Cincinnati, and many others, have been forced out of business by price control. They have been forced out of business through an unjust act. The American people feel that those people should have a proper margin, and that it is only fair to give it to them. If we refuse to give it to them, we create an injustice which I think has had much to do with the break-down of morale in the home front, criticism of the Government, and resentment against the Government, because these things are unjust.

We have had brought to our attention on the floor of the Senate one thing after another which strikes the ordinary man as utterly unjust. It is the result of the absolute theory that we must hold the line regardless of what injustices occur. I say that if the hold-the-line theory is unsound because it freezes injustice, the American people will not approve the freezing of injustice.

In the second place, it is very likely to limit production, and has limited production in many fields, because obviously things change; and as we go on, producers shift their production to the thing which is most profitable. If there is an especially low price for a particular commodity, and we freeze it there, we do not get any of that commodity into production. The hold-the-line theory destroys production. The Senate considers that to be unfair. We put in a provision that the farmer should receive not less than parity, and that his prices should not be frozen below parity, because we thought it was unjust that he should receive a price lower, in comparison, than other sections of the American population were receiving.

After all, getting production is even more important than control of inflation. It is most important that we have production. When that conflicts with inflation, the inflation policy is modified. It has been modified. That breaks down the whole theory that we can freeze prices and wages at a given level and keep them there indefinitely.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I construe the Senator's amendment, it differs only in degree from the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], which was rejected yesterday. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut provided for the continuation of the subsidy-to-consumers program, and authorized the appropriation of one and a half billion dollars.

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, it would continue the subsidy program and authorize an appropriation of \$950,000,000. As I un-

derstand, that represents a difference only in degree. Both amendments would fix upon the country the system of subsidies to consumers at a time when consumers are in a better position to pay for what they consume than ever before in our history. Does not the Senator believe that we ought not to establish a system of subsidies to consumers as a policy at this time?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is no such thing as a subsidy to consumers. The theory that we can distinguish between producer subsidies and consumer subsidies is a complete fallacy. If we pay the producer a subsidy, why do we pay it to him? We pay it to him because he is entitled to a higher price, and we do not wish to pass the higher price on to the consumer. The only purpose of subsidies is to reduce the margin between the producer and the consumer. The question of where to fix the producer's price or the consumer's price is an entirely different question. We have given the O. P. A. authority to fix prices.

On the question of subsidies, it makes no difference to whom the subsidy is paid, the effect and purpose are the same. The purpose is to increase the farmer's price without increasing the consumer's price. In one case which was brought to our attention the purpose was to reduce the consumer's price without reducing the producer's price. That is the purpose of subsidies. We cannot draft a bill which will distinguish between them. We can distinguish so far as concerns the question of who receives the money; but the purpose of all subsidies is exactly the same, and the effect of all subsidies is exactly the same.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a difference, is there not, between a support price and a consumer subsidy?

Mr. TAFT. The support price is a price promised by the Government to the producer. Every subsidy in the whole list is a consumer subsidy. Every one of them reduces the price to the consumer. That is their only purpose. However, a support price is an entirely different thing. That is a promise. If the Senator will allow me to explain, I will digress from my statement and explain this proposal.

It is more than simply an appropriation of \$950,000,000. If the Senator will read the amendment, he will find that, in the first place, it expands the ability of the Government to pay support prices. It provides in so many words that not only may support prices be announced under the Steagall Act, Public Law 147, approved July 1, 1941, but it also provides that—

The War Food Administrator may exercise, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, the powers conferred on the Price Administrator by paragraph (e) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to buy and sell agricultural commodities, and if he announces the price at which he will buy such commodities for any specified crop or period of time, such announcement shall be deemed to establish a support price.

The Steagall Act did not authorize support prices in the case of basic commodities, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco. This would authorize a support price in those cases, as well as in the cases covered by the Steagall Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is not the answer to my question.

Mr. TAFT. No; but I wish to explain the whole thing.

So, in the first place, this amendment authorizes support prices in every case. It authorizes subsidies only in cases in which support prices are announced and maintained. It provides that if the War Food Administrator announces the price at which he will buy the commodity, the Administrator "shall maintain such price or cause such price to be maintained in all producers' markets throughout the United States (unless the support price is limited to particular marketing areas, in which case he shall maintain such price in such areas) either by causing actual purchases to be made by some agency of the United States Government, or by contracts with processors or distributors under which they obligate themselves to pay the support price, or otherwise."

There has been much loose talk about support prices which have not been maintained, notably in the case of hogs. My amendment provides, first, that if a support price is announced, the Government shall use every means at its disposal to maintain such support price.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the support price have to be for any length of time, or would it be in the discretion of the Administrator?

Mr. TAFT. It would be within the discretion of the Administrator. As a rule he announces a support price for one crop, and agrees to maintain it for that crop. My amendment provides that a subsidy may be paid only when a support price has been announced. If it is desired to continue the beef subsidy, about which there has been much dispute, the Government must announce a support price for beef. I do not know whether it can do so. If it cannot, it cannot pay the beef subsidy. If a support price for beef can be established, a subsidy may be paid to the processor, but the support price must be maintained.

In other words, the effect of this rollback subsidy, according to the producer, was to push down the price to the producer. The O. P. A. said, "That was not intended. We did not do it. Other things caused that." In any event, my amendment provides that the subsidy may not be continued unless a support price is maintained. The beef subsidy could not be paid unless a support price for beef was maintained.

The amendment provides further:

All departments and agencies of the Government shall cooperate to secure that result. No maximum price heretofore or hereafter established for any commodity shall be below the support price therefor so announced.

That is in the Bankhead bill, but, of course, the Bankhead bill relates support prices only to the nonbasic commodities.

My amendment provides further that—

In any case in which a support price for an agricultural commodity is announced and maintained, and a fixed maximum price is prescribed for the sale by processors and distributors of any article processed from such agricultural commodity, the War Food Administrator may direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay—

A subsidy. That is the plan. The subsidy can only be paid to reduce the margin between the producer and the consumer. The effort is to make sure that both the producer and the consumer shall receive the benefit of the reduction of the margin. That is the limitation, and that is the only way I can see by which to distinguish between the different kinds of subsidies. If the Government will establish a support price in advance and say to the producer, "If you produce this product you will get this price," then the Government may go further, and in passing the support price on to the consumer it may subsidize the process so that the consumer will not be subjected to the full force of the support price, which is usually an increased price in order to secure greater production. That is the general plan.

The total amount of the subsidy is limited by my amendment to \$950,000,000. That is somewhat more than I personally would propose, but the President asked for that amount in his message. He said he wanted 1 percent of the Government's expenditures, which are about \$95,000,000,000, and I therefore took that amount, because the actual amount did not seem to me to make a great deal of difference, even if it were possible to limit the type of subsidy.

I have included at the end of my amendment a special provision dealing with milk, although there is some question about whether it is necessary, because it practically repeats what is said elsewhere in the bill with respect to particular areas. The language to which I refer reads as follows:

No subsidy shall be paid on liquid milk unless in any particular area a support price is announced and maintained to the producers of milk within that area, in which case payments may be made to the distributors of milk within such area under the authority hereinbefore conferred, provided the margin in the price of milk between the producer and the consumer is thereafter less than it would otherwise be, by the amount per unit of the subsidy.

In other words, a particular milk area can be taken, and we can assure the farmer that he will receive a certain price for his milk. We can then subsidize that price so that the consumer will obtain the benefit of a slightly lower price than would result from the guaranteed price to the farmer.

Mr. President, I wish to return for a moment to the general question relating to the theory of holding the line, and the reason why the general subsidy policy cannot possibly be justified on that ground. As a matter of fact, the Government has not succeeded in holding the line. The actual figures show that, while the cost of living has gone up from 100 to 124½, say 25 percent in 3 years, and

has gone up 5 percent in the last year, the average hourly wage rate paid to labor has gone up from 67.6 cents to 98.9 cents, or an increase of 46 percent.

During the past year, while prices have been held to about 5 percent, the actual cost of labor has gone up 9 percent. The average weekly earnings of labor have gone up from \$26.90 to \$44.90 in 3 years, or an increase of 67 percent. In the past year they have gone up 12 percent.

The inflationary factor, as I see it, is the average hourly wage cost. It may be due to overtime or it may be due to various other things, but the average cost to the employer of 1 hour of labor is the factor which goes into his costs, and that is the factor which is bound to increase the prices ultimately, if the increase actually occurs.

So, in spite of everything which has been done, it has not been possible to hold the line, and it never will be possible because the control of wages is an infinitely difficult problem. They cannot be controlled by law in the way that prices are controlled. It is impossible to prevent thousands of men from striking if they feel so strongly on the subject that they insist upon striking. We cannot put all of them in jail. We can provide remedies, and I think we ought to provide every remedy possible, but in the last analysis we must recognize that there is a certain pressure, and there is always the element of fairness to be taken into consideration.

Why were the wages of coal miners and railroad workers increased? Because the people thought it was fair to increase their wages, and because the workers, to a large extent, had popular support, for the people have never approved the Little Steel formula which says that, although the cost of living has gone up 25 percent, the workers may have their wages increased only 15 percent. The result is that it has not been possible to maintain the hold-the-line theory, and it never will be possible because the American people put justice and fair treatment of individuals ahead of the arbitrary or the intellectual idea of holding the line on inflation.

The attempt has resulted to a large extent not only in injuring the national morale, but it has put many small businessmen out of business. It has threatened a serious reduction in farm production with regard to many products.

I think the policy should be to hold down prices and wages just as much as we possibly can consistent with justice to the wage earner, consistent with justice to the producer, consistent with justice to the distributor, and that is a hard job. The O. P. A. has my sympathy in its effort to accomplish these objectives. But the more they try to insist on the hold-the-line theory, the more difficulties they will encounter. Particularly would that be true if by subsidies they should increase the purchasing power and increase the natural force which is tending to drive prices upward.

I do not see any need of a full subsidy program, but I do believe that subsidies can be used to slow up the process. I think that the use of subsidies is justified if they are limited strictly to cases

where there cannot be a roll-back on to the producer under the formula I have suggested, so that they can be used only in a limited amount, and so that when the subsidies are chosen the money will be spread in the most useful manner.

Let us consider what happened when the miners were given wage increases. The operators merely increased the price of coal. The Government gave up the idea of "holding the line" on the price of coal. I do not know why. However, a subsidy for coal is just as logical as a subsidy for food products. Inevitably here and there it is necessary to yield to some degree. I think that the increase in the cost of living can be held to 5 or 6 percent a year. If we have subsidies to slow it up more, so that there will be no cumulative effect of increasing prices and wages, we will very successfully control prices, and in the end they will not be higher than they are going to be anyway. In other words, I suggest a defense in depth, which is the modern method of defending, instead of the Maginot line which, when it is cracked, will crack for good and bring complete destruction of the whole economic structure of the country.

Every Senator is familiar with the practical situation. The administration is insisting, apparently, on \$1,500,000,000 or nothing. It is insisting on the whole amount. It is insisting that it must "hold the line." I assert that if the Government is to maintain its position, instead of \$1,500,000,000 the amount will be \$4,000,000,000. I think it ought to be willing to accept \$950,000,000 and try to do the best it can with that amount. I think that is a reasonable thing to ask it to do.

On the other hand, those who are insisting on putting through an anti-subsidy bill are going to bring about a veto by the President. We know that because he vetoed the last one. The bill will come back to Congress and the veto will be sustained, for there are not sufficient votes to pass it over a veto. Then what will happen? The lid will be off again.

Payments for subsidies have increased. When we first considered this program almost a year ago subsidies were approximately three or four hundred million dollars; then they got up to \$500,000,000; when Congress came back in the fall the amount was approximately \$850,000,000; before Christmas it was \$1,100,000,000; today it is one billion two hundred or three hundred million dollars, and those who are in charge of the program are asking for a billion and a half dollars. If this bill is vetoed and comes back to Congress and dies, the amount paid for subsidies will be two or three or four billion dollars.

Congress enacted a measure containing some loose language. I do not think it justified subsidies but we were not careful enough about our language, and the claimed powers are in the law, and, unless we can pass a bill over the President's veto or unless the President agrees to the bill, those powers are going to stay there, and are going to be exercised, and I do not know how we can prevent their

being exercised. The result of passing this bill is simply going to bring about a situation in which Congress has relaxed its control, and cannot recover its control, and perhaps there may be three or four billion dollars a year spent without the slightest vestige of authority from the present Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the Senator any proof from any of the agencies or departments which are interested in the administration of subsidies that if his amendment would be agreed to the bill would not be vetoed?

Mr. TAFT. No, I have no such understanding and no such agreement. I think that if my amendment should be agreed to, that is if those who oppose subsidies should wholeheartedly agree to it, it might be passed over the President's veto. That is my impression of the line-up in the Senate today. I doubt very much if the President would veto a subsidy bill that carries \$950,000,000. I think he would put himself in an indefensible position if he should veto it, because the difference is very slight.

The chief subsidy which I think would have to be abandoned would be the milk subsidy, which is being paid individually to 3,000,000 farmers. I do not believe that that is a sound subsidy. It certainly is opposed by the representatives of the milk farmers themselves. It amounts to about \$300,000,000. If that were omitted and paid in the way I suggest, I believe it could be done for \$100,000,000, and there could be saved about \$200,000,000. With the exceptions which have been made in the case of oils, my impression is that the remainder of the subsidy program could be carried out if the administration wished to continue the meat subsidy. I see no reasonable ground on which to veto this bill if my amendment should be adopted.

I might say on the milk subsidy that Mr. Holman, who is head of the dairy farmers, in his testimony before the committee, said:

The feed subsidy is estimated to be \$315,000,000 a year, and I wish to give that one particular attention. This subsidy varies all the way from 30 cents per hundred pounds of fluid milk in the Middle West to as high as 50 cents per hundred pounds in southern New England and in parts of some States such as Tennessee, Kansas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Mississippi, and it includes also a butterfat subsidy ranging from 4 to 6 cents per pound. That is on separated cream.

Now, there are about 3,000,000 farmers in this country, out of the estimated 6,000,000 who produce milk, that actually sell milk or separate cream or farm butter for commercial purposes. Every one of these farmers has to be found and enrolled, and to do that requires a very large army of either full-time or part-time employees. It is my understanding that the Government is using about 125,000 of these people already, farmers alone, who are being called from their farms at a time when the production is needed, to ride the roads and find these other farmers and help make settlements, and so on.

Letters have been sent out all over the country urging farmers to take advan-

tage of the subsidy. I have one which is found in the record, which says:

If farmers will bring their records to the Davis County—

That is Davis County, Iowa—

If the farmers will bring their records to the Davis County Agricultural Adjustment Administration office, their claims will be satisfied and sight drafts drawn on the Commodity Corporation for payment.

In other words, they are restoring the old A. A. A. payments and the amounts are being paid through the A. A. A. to 3,000,000 individual farmers.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. Does the amendment proposed by the Senator provide that subsidies may be paid only on the particular things mentioned in the amendment, or will we face the same proposition we are facing today? In other words, will the Administration, if the Senator's proposal becomes the law, pay subsidies so far as the particular commodities mentioned are concerned to the extent of \$950,000,000, and then go ahead and pay the other kind of subsidies from money they may be able to maintain from other sources to any extent they may see fit?

Mr. TAFT. No; that would not be possible, because I do not change the provisions of the Bankhead bill, on page 9, which read as follows:

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities—

And so forth.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, if the amendment were adopted and became the law, Congress would take back unto itself the right to say how much shall be spent for subsidies and the manner in which it shall be spent.

Mr. TAFT. Entirely. My proposal is that we do that, and recover all of our power over the public purse, which we have abandoned, or, perhaps I should say, not abandoned but which we have been careless about. My amendment would provide for the year 1944 \$950,000,000. That amount, however, would not be provided year after year, but for the year 1945 the Administration would have to come back and ask for what they need for the 1945 program. The amendment simply provides that for the 1944 program we will grant \$950,000,000 for use in the payment of subsidies.

I might say that there is another reason why I think it is wise to give some subsidies. I think we could have gotten along without a subsidy program; but if we should abolish them all at once there would ensue a sudden increase in prices which might well stimulate wage increases. The price increases coming all at one time would be particularly noticeable and would be much more likely to start a spiral than if they had occurred gradually during the year. That is another reason why I think that the program should be tapered off, and not completely abandoned.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. A few moments ago the Senator from Ohio referred to the fact that 3,000,000 dairy farmers were eligible for the subsidy under the present program. It is my understanding that only 71 percent of those who have been eligible to receive the milk subsidy have collected such subsidy as has been available to them since the 1st of October. That number represents 80 percent of the milk production which is eligible to receive subsidies. It shows conclusively that it is the small producers, who undoubtedly need it much more than some of the larger ones, who have been deprived of their milk subsidy for one reason or another. In a good many cases it is probably because greater effort and expense were entailed in getting the subsidy than the payment would amount to when it was received.

However, at the present time we are subsidizing milk in the sum of over \$300,000,000 a year, and all dairy products to the extent of about \$441,000,000 a year. The War Food Administrator evidently recognizes that the subsidy which is being paid at the present time is wholly inadequate.

I have in my hand a release issued on February 2, last week, containing an announcement of the War Food Administration, which reads as follows:

The War Food Administration today announced the continuation of dairy production payments up to February 17, or the date on which the Commodity Credit Corporation is further extended. The basic rates during such period will be the same as those in effect for January.

While dairy farmers have been affected by increased costs since the program was first announced, Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, pointed out that a commitment had been made with the Congress not to change substantially the subsidy program now in effect prior to February 17.

Subject to action by the Congress continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation without limitations preventing dairy production payments, Mr. Jones stated that thereafter rates for the remainder of February and for March and April would be adjusted to take into account increases in feed and other costs since the original rates were established last October.

The War Food Administrator said he is desirous of recognizing these increased costs in the dairy payments as soon as it is possible to do so, and further expressed the hope that in the interim dairy farmers would continue to produce and market the milk that is so essential for the war effort.

For the spring and summer months, it was indicated that it would be the Administrator's intention to continue the general dairy payments at seasonally lower rates during the time when pastures are more productive. The rates would be seasonally higher next fall and winter. The whole program is contingent, the Administrator emphasized, upon congressional action continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation without limitations preventing such payments. Subject to such contingency, the rates for next summer will be determined and announced before the 1st of May; and for next winter, before the 1st of September.

So, when we are estimating the costs of the dairy subsidy we must not consider it \$441,000,000 a year, which is the present rate, but it is my personal opinion that it would have to be about twice that if we are to take care of the milk production by the subsidy method.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. My understanding is that the farmer says, "We want a fair price for milk. We do not want to have to go to the A. A. A. office and get a subsidy. We want the price to which we are entitled paid when we go to the store." That can be done under the amendment I suggest. In the Cincinnati area, for instance, where I live, it can be announced that the price of milk shall be so much a hundred pounds, and the Government will see that it is that. The distributors will pay it, of course, and if we do not want to pass it on to the consumer, we can subsidize it in that area. That is the proposal I make.

I think the farmers are interested in getting their price, but when they say that price must be passed on to the consumer, I think they are going a little further than they are quite entitled to go.

I do not think that is so much their concern. I do not know whether under the proposal I make the beef subsidy can be continued. It cannot be continued without changing the whole set-up.

My own belief as to meat is that the best way to control is to take all the price controls off beef, and impose a very strict rationing on the consumer. I believe that if we do that we can hold the price of beef, and that we will not have the difficulty we have today, trying to fix prices on all the different grades and cuts, and paying the packers tremendous subsidies on beef. I believe that is the best solution of the beef problem, but I do not see how the Congress can decide what shall be done about beef, what shall be done about oil seeds, or what shall be done about wool. We would have to treat peanut oil one way, soybean oil another way, wool another way, sugar another way. I do not see how Congress can believe it can know the way in which these different products should be handled. Yet today we say to the administration, "You can pay subsidies in any way you desire, on vegetable oils, on wool, on sugar, but you cannot pay subsidies on meat."

I think we must have an underlying, logical system, but I think we must leave the actual administration of the system to the War Food Administrator and the O. P. A.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what the

position of the sugar industry will be in case the Senator's proposal becomes law.

Mr. TAFT. I have in the amendment the same provisions as to sugar that are found in the Bankhead bill. There is no difference.

Of course, the original sugar payment was always acceptable. That is regarded as rather a redistribution of the sugar itself than anything else, and it has been paid for years. The other payment, to guarantee the price of beets, so to speak, really establishes a support price for beets, and I think that subsidy could be paid under the general language of my amendment. But I left in the exception that was in the Bankhead bill, to make it perfectly certain that the exception would be in the law, and that there could not be any dispute about the language.

Mr. President, I do not know that we can get away from the irreconcilable difference which arises, but I do not see any reason why the administration should not be glad to settle this matter. I think the idea that they would rather go ahead under unlawful authority, that they would rather go ahead in defiance of the will of Congress, is an utterly unreasonable position to take. It seems to me the Senators who voted for the Maloney amendment should very much prefer voting for my amendment, and put through a measure which, I can assure them, will be practical, which will limit subsidies to an effective and reasonable form of subsidy, which will furnish an amount which can be used to provide for subsidies in reasonable form. On the other hand, I think those who vote to put the bill through knowing that it will be vetoed, simply because they are against subsidies, knowing that it will actually increase the amount of the subsidies rather than decrease them, are also taking an unreasonable position.

I submit to the Senate that if my remedy is not the correct one, then it should be criticized and worked out to a satisfactory form, but it has been evolved after a long series of conferences, even with the Solicitor of the War Food Administration, and with those on both sides of the question, and I feel very confident that it presents a correct solution.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, during these times when subsidies are being so widely discussed it is interesting to turn back the pages of history and read what was said in 1893 by that immortal Governor of Texas, James Stephen Hogg.

Governor Hogg is recognized to this day as being one of the most ardent and outstanding defenders of the rights of the rank and file of the common citizens ever to hold public office in Texas.

His public statement of May 20, 1893, against Federal bounties, which we now call Federal subsidies, is certainly sound logic, in addition to being correct prophecy.

With all the mess we are now in on the domestic front in this Nation on account of subsidies, and the Federal Government trying to dictate how each and every individual must run his own private business, we are certainly getting a generous taste of what Governor Hogg in 1893 called "the polluted fruits of

crime against justice and the Constitution." I believe this statement by Gov. James Stephen Hogg, of Texas, made a half century ago, is one of the strongest and most logical arguments against subsidies that could be made. Coming from that sane age in our American history, it deserves the careful reading and study of some of the would-be statesmen of our present fantastic Government age.

I ask unanimous consent that the full statement of Gov. James Stephen Hogg, of Texas, issued on the subject of bounties on May 20, 1893, be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF TEXAS,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Austin, Tex., May 20, 1893.

To the Public:

By the authority vested in the Governor by the constitution, I hereby give notice and make public proclamation that I disapprove house bill No. 206, passed by the last legislature, which proposed "to authorize, empower, and direct the superintendent of the State penitentiaries to receive from the Treasurer of the United States, for the general revenue of the State, the bounty on sugar raised and manufactured on the State penitentiary convict farms," received in the executive office on the 9th day of this month.

I vetoed such a law as this 2 years ago, and shall never consent to one like it so long as I represent public interests and can read the Constitution of the United States and understand the principles upon which this Government was founded.

It is well for the public to look at this sugar bounty in the light of the Federal law granting it.

In schedule E of the act of Congress approved October 1, 1890, the United States Government directs that until July 1905 there shall be paid from any moneys in the Treasury at Washington not otherwise appropriated, to the producer of sugar, testing not less than 90° by the polariscope, from beets, sorghum, or sugarcane grown within the United States, a bounty of 2 cents per pound, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

To entitle the producer of sugar to this bounty he must file, prior to the 1st day of July each year, with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, a notice of the place of production, with a general description of the machinery and methods to be employed by him, an estimate of the amount of sugar proposed to be produced in the current or next ensuing year, and make an application for license to so produce, accompanied by a bond in a penalty and with sureties, to be approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, conditioned that he will faithfully observe all rules and regulations that shall be prescribed for such manufacture and production.

On receiving the application and bond, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is required by this law to "issue to the applicant a license to produce sugar" at the place, with the machinery, and by the methods described in the application. No one can get the bounty without having first procured the "license" from the United States to produce the sugar, and the law expressly confers the power on the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to "make all needful rules and regulations for the manufacture of sugar," and to "exercise supervision and

inspection thereof." All persons raising less than 500 pounds of the article a year are excluded from the benefits of the bounty. Those who engage in the manufacture of it under this license from the United States are subject to prosecution in the Federal courts and to a fine of not over \$500, together with imprisonment for a period of not exceeding 5 years, for certain infractions of the law.

The State of Texas has a plantation of 2,000 acres, worked last year by 165 second-class convicts, by which was produced about 1,000,000 pounds of sugar. The yield this year will be probably at least that amount, with the prospect of a heavy annual increase. So that, under this law of the United States, she would be permitted to receive a bounty of at least \$20,000 each year hereafter until 1905 if I permit the act of the legislature under consideration to become a law.

In the first place, I believe that Congress was guilty of a usurpation of power in passing the bounty act, and that to accept money from such source the State government would be an accessory to the crime.

In the second place, I believe the State would debase her dignity, prostitute her honor, and appear before civilization as a humiliated suckling holding onto the breast of the Federal Government if she accepts the bounty.

Such laws are fundamentally wrong, subversive of the powers of Government, undemocratic, paternalistic in the extreme, and no State can be a party to, connive at or ratify them without a surrender of its self-respect.

If the fathers were correct in teaching that the Federal Government is one of strictly limited powers—that its powers are enumerated, specified, and particularized, and that whatever is not delegated to it by the Constitution, nor prohibited by that instrument to the States, is withheld and reserved to them, then I am unable to trace the fight to grant this special benefit to the favored few in the way of the sugar bounty to any source of power except that which lies in the arbitrary will of Congress. It is a forced and unfair construction of the Constitution to hold that Congress possesses the power under the "general welfare" clause to collect money from the masses with which to defray the expenses of and to pay a premium to those engaged in private pursuits. The express purpose of the people in framing and of the States in adopting the Constitution was to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to "ourselves and our posterity." The powers of the Congress were limited to the accomplishment of these ends. How can an appropriation out of the General Treasury to be paid to sugar raisers aid in forming a more perfect union? How can it establish justice? How will it insure domestic tranquillity? How can it provide for the common defense? How does it promote the general welfare? How can it secure the blessings of liberty "to ourselves and our posterity"? If it fails to accomplish some of these purposes, then the Congress had not the power to make the appropriation. All observant men see and understand that the excuse for all such usurpation of power by the Congress, exercised invariably at the expense of the great mass of the people for the enrichment of the few who fill the lobbies around the Capitol, finds a cloak under the clause of the Constitution which authorizes that body to "provide for the general welfare of the United States." I cannot understand how it is to the general welfare of the several States, or of the United States, or of the people of the United States, for Texas to be given a bounty by the Federal Government for raising sugar. This product, it is true,

is of common use among the people, and its cheapness to them is desirable. So it may be said of cotton, wheat, oats, corn, rice, hay, beef, pork, poultry, potatoes, goobers, melons, pine-rosin, and all other articles of real or apparent necessity among the masses. The State can, with her 3,600 convicts, raise all these products in great abundance at a fine profit, if the general Government grants, and she shall accept, a bounty on them. There is as much authority for Congress to give a bounty on chickens as on sugar. If the purpose is to promote the general welfare, it would appear that articles of necessity, such as bread, meat, and clothing, would be the first on which a bounty should be given. This would reach and help the wheat and corn raiser, the herdsman and the cotton planter, and give cheap food and raiment to the millions. Indeed, it would put millions in the pockets of the great army of producers now struggling under heavy burdens, and add the finishing touch to the ideal government of those who regard the "bounty system" as the catholicon of all economic ills; and, further, it would furnish to civilization an example of the generosity of Congress, displayed in the exercise of its discretionary power, in providing for the general welfare of the United States.

The authority of Texas to take this money from the Federal Government demonstrates the evil of the paternal system into which our General Government is drifting. It strongly supports the suspicion that none but those who are able to help themselves need apply. Texas needs no assistance in farming. Sugar raisers as a rule are the wealthiest planters. There are no poor ones engaged in the business in this State. Most of them are very rich, in every respect beyond the necessity of Government aid. The State's farm of 2,000 acres, on which she makes sugar and cotton, is worth less than many of those nearby belonging to individuals, and it is valued at \$245,256. After deducting all expenses of maintenance and operation last year without any bounty the crop on this farm yielded the State, according to the report of the financial agent, a new profit of \$61,976. The report of the superintendent of penitentiaries shows that for the period of the past 6 years the crops have yielded her the aggregate net sum of \$229,968. When the low prices during this period are considered, with the further fact that the farm is worked by such convicts as are unfit for use within the walls and cannot be hired out, then some idea may be had of the profits of the sugar business operated on a large scale. If Congress was considering the "general welfare of the United States" when it rallied to the aid of the rich planters engaged in this profitable private industry in the bestowal on them of this liberal bounty, it may be pertinently asked, How far does the Government stand committed to this precedent to assist those following less remunerative pursuits when they shall call for help? To the needy alms should go. This is the rule of charity. If followed to its logical result, where will this precedent end? The Government cannot be operated without revenue. Without it all the work in her departments would cease. Government revenue is no more nor less than money collected from the people by taxation in some form or other. After all, it comes out of the production of the soil. To support this bounty all farmers must be taxed. For this and other purposes, with crushing force the Government unceasingly lays its tax-reaping hand on the fruits of labor. From this cause murmurings are heard everywhere. It now takes annually at least 30 percent of the active circulating medium of the United States to pay Federal taxes. The people are tired of this condition, and they ought to be. Departure by the Government from its

legitimate functions is the cause. Favoritism of the few at the expense of the many is the method. These bounty laws are governmental crimes, the culmination of paternalistic iniquity. Those who receive benefits are blinded to the evils lurking in them. Strong resistance will be made to the abrogation of the sugar bounty, but Texas cannot by my act or acquiescence become committed to the movement. The wrong should be wiped out and our State should take part in the work. She cannot with clean hands do so if she accepts the money. Driftwood on a great stream at first seems harmless. Let it alone, and in time the river's current becomes changed by it, submerging the country all round. So with this bounty law. Permit it to stand, and the Government will follow the course already changed from a republic to a centralism, sweeping in its way the liberties of the people. Shall Texas be accessory to this crime? No; not with my consent.

On another point I oppose the State's acceptance of the bounty. In the management of her affairs she is sovereign, supreme, subject only to the control of the people within her dominion. To accept this bounty for sugar she would surrender the supervision and inspection of one of her most important industries to the Federal Government. For spoils she would open the way for the invasion and final destruction of her independent autonomy. For a mess of pottage, seasoned with the sacrifice of principle, boiled in sin, she would surrender her birthright.

To procure this money she must file with the Federal Commissioner of Internal Revenue a notice of the place of production. To him she must give a description of the machinery and methods employed by her in the work. To him she must give an estimate of the amount of sugar she proposes to produce. To him she must make application for a license to follow the pursuit. To him she must look for rules and regulations of the business. To him she must give bond and sureties that she will obey the law. To him she must yield inspection and supervision of her farming operations. To him she must become bound by bond that she will not only obey the law but that she will faithfully observe all rules and regulations that shall be prescribed by him for the manufacture of sugar. For infraction of the law her agents and officers would be subject to prosecution, fine, and imprisonment through the Federal courts. We all know what this means. Spies, informers, and irresponsible deputy marshals would swagger and lurk around the farm worse than the locusts of Egypt. Nothing would please them better than to "rope" the State of Texas into the national court, where they could magnify the power of the Federal judge at the expense of her independence and integrity.

Other potent reasons should move the State to refuse this bounty. She is no pauper or mendicant. She is a sovereign State in the full control of her institutions, capable of repelling with indignation every subtle effort made to destroy her autonomy. When she needs money she will resort to constitutional means and call on Texans to pay it. She would not appeal to Massachusetts, Georgia, or other States to help her; nor will she accept money paid for public purposes by her sisters to the Federal Government simply because the Congress is willing, in the exercise of arbitrary power, in defiance of the Constitution, to let her have it. For the sake of the masses, now taxed beyond endurance through the vicious, insidious tariff system, for the respect due to her own people, for the preservation of her own independence, for the perpetuity of sound principles of government, the State of Texas now, and so long as I am Governor, shall treat this sugar bounty with derisive contempt. She will not handicap her Senators and Congressmen in the performance of their duties to

have the law repealed; she will not stultify her statehood; she will not violate democratic pledges to strike down such measures; she will not stain her hands nor dishonor her name by the acceptance of this money—the polluted fruits of crime against justice and the Constitution.

Very respectfully,

J. S. HOGG,
Governor of Texas.

THE SPIRIT OF GUNG HO

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as the protracted congressional controversy continues with bitterness and rancor to delay a solution of the soldier-vote bill, and as we now discuss the subsidy program after months of delay, our boys—our own sons, and those of our neighbors back home—are facing death, sudden or slow, on the stained and rocky beach-heads of Italy. Their loved ones at home wait the news with fear, and pray with agony in their hearts that their boys may somehow escape horrible massacre by powerful and entrenched artillery cruelly commanding the fish-bowl beachhead.

Surely, at this time, with American boys fighting desperately to defend democracy over wide-flung areas, the leaders of democratic government should find the energy and inspiration loyally and efficiently to serve democratic government at home.

Unlike Italy, in the Pacific the tide of victory runs strongly for our forces and there is little need to express on the Senate floor the pride and gratitude of the American people in the magnificent accomplishments of the members of the armed forces fighting today in the Marshall Islands of the central Pacific. No one can now doubt that the American triumph which started here will sweep ultimately across the Pacific to Truk and finally to Tokyo itself. Nonetheless, I cannot refrain from adding to the proud collective voice of America that of the Senate of the United States. Here, Senators, is tangible proof of the ability of America to fight an all-out war. Here is demonstrated her great ability in mass production and technology, translated from peacetime activities into the desperate need of the war effort; here is but another proof of that axiom well known to us all—"The whole is greater than the part." Our boys are, of course, fighting individually for their homes and for their States, but, Senators, on the field of battle there is time only for unity of action toward a common goal. It is the inherent realization of soldiers that unless they stand united, death or surrender will be their fate. We of the Senate might well heed their example and work likewise in harmony with each other lest the pattern of our work be lost by too great an emphasis on the individual parts, by furious and futile controversies discouraging and confusing the Nation.

The story of the assault on Makin Island, in the Gilberts, south of the Marshalls, in August 1942, the prologue of the present fighting in the Marshalls, is one of the finest illustrations of harmonious action—action which indicated that America had finally taken the offensive and had set the stage for later victories to come.

The leader of the group which accomplished this raid, Lt. Col. Evans F. Carlson, had before him a momentous task. His goal, as stated by him, was—

To create and perfect a cohesive, smooth-functioning team which, by virtue of its harmony of action, unity of purpose, and its invincible determination, would be able to outpoint the enemy on every count.

Most important of all, he found, was the development of the so-called gung ho spirit, the Chinese expression of harmoniously working together, and which is exemplified in the truly great and inspiring film of the same name, *Gung Ho*, recently released, produced by Walter Wanger, president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, himself a soldier in the First World War. Recently I had the opportunity to view this film and to me it brought a profound realization of the dangers and sacrifices of our fighting men and a renewed determination that we in the United States should subjugate our own passions, prejudices, wants, and needs to a greater and more unified national effort to support the members of the armed forces upon whom principally fall the sacrifice and the burden of the war. Any American seeing this film *Gung Ho* would resolve thereafter I am sure for more harmonious work in the common and sacred war effort.

On this first anniversary of the Makin raid, Colonel Carlson in an address to the Allied Nations armed forces serving overseas concluded his remarks:

As a military venture this raid was not of any great import; its significance lay in the fact that America had taken the offensive; that American men had outwitted, outfought, and outmaneuvered the Japanese at their own game. It was significant also because these marine raiders had demonstrated how individual intelligence and initiative and resourcefulness can be applied with benefit to military operations, when they are developed and brought to bear in the democratic way.

There is no limit to the potential power and accomplishment of freemen who unite for common effect in the democratic manner. No dictatorship, no oligarchy can stand against freedom, tolerance, and truth. These are the principles for which the Allied Nations fight.

And, finally, may I quote to the Senate the concluding speech of the film *Gung Ho*, as made by the leader of the Makin raid:

Our course is clear. . . . It is for us at this moment to dedicate again our hearts, our minds, and bodies to the great task that lies ahead. We must go further and dedicate ourselves also to the monumental task of assuring that the peace which follows this holocaust will be a just and equitable and conclusive peace. And beyond that lies the mission of making certain that the social order which we bequeath to our sons and daughters is truly based on the freedom for which these men died.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Reed
Andrews	Guffey	Revercomb
Austin	Gurney	Reynolds
Bailey	Hatch	Robertson
Ball	Hawkes	Russell
Bankhead	Hayden	Shipstead
Barkley	Hill	Smith
Bilbo	Holman	Stewart
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chandler	Maloney	Wagner
Chavez	Maybank	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Connally	Moore	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	Wherry
Davis	Murray	White
Downey	Nye	Wiley
Eastland	O'Daniel	Willis
Ellender	Overton	Wilson
Ferguson	Pepper	
George	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, because of the eloquence of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and other Senators who yesterday discussed inflation, I shall not speak about the inflationary problem involved in subsidies. I have before to some extent discussed that phase of the matter.

However, I wish to point out that according to a recent report of the Secretary of the Treasury, nearly \$20,000,000,000 of currency is loose around the country. That is nearly four times more currency in circulation than has been in circulation in normal times. On some other occasion I hope to address the Senate on the significance of that situation and its threat to our national economy, but I shall not go into that matter further today.

I have some statistics and figures by way of comparison which I think may be enlightening, if not amazing, as to the cost of subsidies, their effect, who receives their benefits, and by way of comparison between the present price level and the price level existing in 1917 and 1918, because those 2 years have been held out as the top years in which there was a high cost of living, and as the fundamental excuse for paying subsidies now.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its Bulletin No. 300, entitled "United States Average Retail Prices," published in 1922, has given the average retail bread prices in 51 leading cities for the years 1917 and 1918, namely, during the 2 years of the First World War, as follows: 9.2 cents for a 16-ounce loaf in 1917, and 9.8 cents in 1918. They were a

fraction lower than 1943 prices on all grades of bread. A slightly higher retail price, around 10 cents a loaf, came in 1919 and 1920, after the war was over. But the war price averaged 9.6 cents for a 16-ounce loaf.

What does the O. P. A. threaten to do to the price of bread today if Congress declines to vote for subsidies? The half page of grocery price boosts published in the New York Times of November 17, less than 90 days ago, gives the O. P. A. "roll-back" price at 17 cents for a 17½-ounce loaf of bread, or an equivalent of nearly 16 cents for a 16-ounce loaf which in 1918 sold for 9.8 cents.

In other words, the O. P. A. threatens to boost the retail price of a loaf of bread 6.2 cents, or more than the 60 percent, unless we grant a subsidy of \$1,500,000,000, notwithstanding the fact that the farm price of wheat is lower now by 75 cents a bushel than 25 years ago.

The subsidy agencies of the Federal Government base their demand for \$1,500,000,000 subsidy to processors to "keep down the price of bread," as they call it, on the ground of the high price of wheat paid to the farmer. When they talk about "the price of bread," I assume they include all the articles necessary for food.

What are the facts?

First, what is the share of the retail grocery price which the wheat grower receives for raising the crop?

On page 20 of the 1944 Agricultural Outlook Charts, just issued by the Department of Agriculture, we read that the wheat grower in August 1943 got the following percentages of the retail price:

Item	Retail price	Farmer's share
White bread.....	100	24
Whole-wheat bread.....	100	19
Soda crackers.....	100	12
Wheat cereal.....	100	19
Macaroni.....	100	22
Average.....	100	19.2

The miller for his flour received 48 percent of the retail price of the finished product—the bakery, cereal manufacturer, wholesaler, and Government taxes getting the remaining 32.8 percent.

That is to say, the Government subsidy cry is based on the assumption that the 19.2 cents which the farmer gets from the retail dollar is so excessive that the Government has to give a \$100,000,000 subsidy to the processors in order to keep down the price of bread.

The subsidy agencies of the Government make no complaint against those who collect, in all, 80-odd cents of the retail dollar. The whole complaint is against the farmers' share of 19.2 cents. This less than one-fifth going to the farmer for raising the wheat bears the whole brunt of the subsidy agency indictment. In the eyes of subsidy propagandists, this one-fifth that goes back to the farmer is greater than the four-fifths reaped by the processors and the Government. The subsidy argument reverses Euclid, who began his great mathematical thesis on the proposition

that "the whole is greater than any of its parts." It happens that American history, no farther back than the last World War, stands by Euclid, as against the New Deal argument for subsidy.

The average farm price of wheat in the last World War—1917-1918—ranged 75 cents a bushel higher than the price which Government subsidy propagandists complain against now. The farmers in the last World War were getting more than the present 19 cents of the retail dollar of the bread and cereal consumer. Yet the price of bread was stabilized at around 9.5 cents for a 16-ounce loaf—without one dollar of the \$100,000,000 subsidy which the Government asks for now.

For the wheat in a pound loaf—.95 pound wheat—the farmer today gets 2 cents, as compared to a fraction over 3 cents in 1917-1918. Yet the subsidy agencies of the Federal Government say that this 2 cents received by the farmer can no longer be paid unless either the price of bread goes up or the Government pays a \$100,000,000 subsidy to the processors and the wheat buyers. This is the story in a nutshell, in comparing the retail price of bread in 1943 with the price in 1917 and 1918.

It will be seen that in the last war, when the United States Government paid no subsidy and had no autocratic O. P. A. bureau, there was no trouble about maintaining a stabilized 9½-cent loaf, although the wheat growers received on the farm at that time an average of \$2.05 a bushel.

There are subsidies being paid now to packers, processors, distributors, and retailers. Who are they? The indictment is brought against the farmer for the high cost of living. Companies capitalized in the aggregate for hundreds of millions of dollars and enjoying war contracts of hundreds of millions of dollars, are receiving subsidies. In the October bulletin of the Department of Agriculture, on the Agricultural Situation, page 7, it is shown that the average farm price of wheat has risen from \$1.028 in September 1942, to \$1.30 in September 1943. It is a little higher now. This is based upon the report of September and October 1943. The parity price for September wheat was \$1.46.

In a list of 21 leading farm products, in 1943 wheat and butterfat were below parity. In the meantime the prices of the things which the farmer had to buy had risen 66 percent. The price of farm machinery had risen to the point where a second-hand tractor cost more than it formerly cost new, while wages have about doubled, and in some cases trebled. The farmer receives less profit from his \$1.30 in September 1943, or about \$1.40 now, than he realized from a price of \$1.28 in 1941. On the other hand, finished products put on the retail market by the processors, such as soda crackers and macaroni, have advanced in price not 27 percent, as in the case of wheat, but from 75 to 100 percent. It will be seen that the subsidies do not go to farmers, when prices are below parity, on most products, or were until recently.

Prices of most staples are below parity. But the farmer is indicted. Processing companies which have war contracts and receive war prices for their products receive the Government subsidy. That is a new deal. It follows the Biblical saying, "To him who hath shall be given."

One of the most significant features of the wholesale-retail problem in connection with present food prices is the high margin between the wholesale price of food and the retail price. It was more than twice as high in 1943, under the O. P. A., than it was in 1917, 1918, and 1919, when there was no O. P. A. to "crack down" on grocers and consumers.

The following figures are taken from a recent bulletin of the Department of Agriculture entitled "Marketing and Transportation," comparing retail, wholesale, and farm prices in the United States from 1913 to 1943. In 1917 and 1918 the margin between wholesale and retail prices averaged only 10 percent, as is shown on page 28 of the bulletin. The figures are as follows:

Year	Retail price index	Wholesale prices	Margin
1917 average.....	112	103	9
1918 average.....	128	117	11
2-year average....	120	110	10

In the 4 months of 1943 ending August, the retail-wholesale margin was:

Months, 1943	Retail prices	Wholesale prices	Margin
May.....	143	109	34
June.....	142	108	34
July.....	136	106	30
August.....	133	104	29
4-month average..	138	107	31

The margin increased more than three times.

I point this out to show that those who are handling farm products are the ones who are to blame. I have a statement of beef prices for 1917. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record for comparison with meat prices at the present time at grocery stores.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Figures for 1917-18 are from Bureau of Labor Statistics		O. P. A. ceiling Washington, Feb. 10, 1944 ¹		
	1917	1918	AA	A	B
Round steak.....	29	36	47	44	39
Rib roast.....	25	31	35 ²	33 ²	31 ²
Pork chops.....	32	39	39 ³	36 ³	34 ³
Bacon, per pound, sliced.....	41	53			42 ⁴
Sirloin steak.....	31	34	46	44	36
Leg of lamb.....	29	35	44	42	38
Chuck roast.....	21	27	32	30	28

¹ This is 1944 ceiling price.

² 10-inch.

³ 7-inch.

⁴ Rib.

⁵ End.

⁶ Swift Premium.

In 1917-18 beef cattle sold from \$15 to \$17 a hundred pounds—hogs about the same. Hogs yield the farmer now \$8 to \$13 on the farm. Look up your hog prices now.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. With respect to the high cost of O. P. A. and subsidies, let me say that some time ago a message from the White House told us that one and a half billion dollars must be paid from the Treasury in subsidies.

We find the price of sirloin steak, if sirloin could be obtained at all last year, running to a 1943 average of approximately 50 cents a pound. When we turn to the food prices listed by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for the year 1918, the last year of World War No. 1, we find that the average price of sirloin steak in American cities in the year 1918 was 38.9 cents a pound. In other words, we were getting our sirloin steak in 1943, under the O. P. A. and subsidies, at an average price 30 percent higher than in 1918 without O. P. A., and without subsidies.

For round steak, in 1943, under O. P. A. and subsidies, the coal miners of Pennsylvania were paying an average price of 45 cents, compared with 36.9 cents in 1918, without O. P. A. and without subsidies, or 22 percent higher than during the last World War.

In 1943 rib roast, under O. P. A. and subsidies, cost from 36 cents to 45 cents a pound, compared with an average price of less than 31 cents for all cities in the United States in 1918, without O. P. A. and roll-back subsidies. In this instance we were paying an average of 20 percent higher than prices of beef during the last war.

In 1918 cheese brought an average United States price of 35.9 cents a pound, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1943, in Washington, under O. P. A. and subsidies, the price of cheese hovered around 50 cents a pound most of the time. Sometimes it was less and sometimes it was higher, but always well above the prices of 1918, when there was no O. P. A. and no roll-back subsidy.

Bananas for civilian consumption have been rare in the United States ever since the O. P. A. machine began to work. In 1918 the average price of bananas in American cities was 38.3 cents a dozen, or a trifle more than 3 cents apiece, less than one-half the O. P. A. ceiling for the few people in the United States who have the rare privilege of seeing a banana at this time.

It appears from cost-of-living statistics and from retail grocery advertisements during the period of the two wars that on the average food prices in American cities under the O. P. A. in 1943 are approximately 20 percent above retail prices in 1918.

On a yearly food consumption of \$15,000,000,000 for the country at large in 1943, the civilian cost of bureaucratic regulation approximates \$3,000,000,000 a year. Part of this \$3,000,000,000 cost-of-living charge is chargeable to O. P. A., part to lease-lend, part to priorities, public debt, and mounting taxes.

Significant of the food price upward trend is table I of the Commerce Department survey of current business for November 1943.

On page 7 of this report the Secretary of Commerce presents the annual volume of retail sales for various kinds of businesses by years, taking the first 9 months of 1943 as a basis for the estimate. The increase in the price of food sold in retail stores for 1943 over previous years is highly significant. The total for 1929 was \$13,092,000,000; for 1940 it was \$14,780,000,000; for 1941, \$17,372,000,000; and for 1943, the total was \$25,000,000,000.

So we find that, based on Commerce Department estimates, the retail cost of food to American consumers in 1943 compared with 1941, when O. P. A. was launched, has risen \$4,424,000,000, or 35 percent.

If we add the sales of eating and drinking places to the sales of the retail groceries and chain stores, the increase for 1943 over 1941 in 2 years of O. P. A. is \$7,428,000,000, or 42 percent.

Compared with 1929, with its 9-month prosperity boom, the country's retail food bill in 1943 has risen more than \$6,000,000,000, or nearly 55 percent.

So much for the widely advertised "economy achievement" of the O. P. A. in its effect on the long-forgotten consumer.

WORLD'S BIGGEST AND MOST COSTLY BUREAU

In the recent tabulation of executive bureaus and departments, laid before the Senate by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] in behalf of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Office of Price Administration is given an official personnel of 119,000, including more than 55,000 employees on the civil-service list, and 64,000 on war price and ration boards. This exceeds the total official personnel of any other Federal bureau and even the total for any executive department, except War, Navy, and Post Office.

The 119,000 employees of the O. P. A. exceed by 35,000 the total number of employees of the United States Treasury and its several revenue bureaus. They exceed by 42,000 the total for all branches of the Agriculture Department. The number represents more than three times the total for the Commerce Department and its seven branches. It is more than 12 times the total for the State Department or the Labor Department.

The War Department's peacetime personnel in 1937 was listed at 89,000. The O. P. A.'s 119,000 employees exceeds that figure by 30,000, and the salaried cost of the O. P. A. far exceeds the total cost of the Government of Mexico.

Actual and complete Federal Government costs of the O. P. A. set-up are not easy to arrive at. Appropriations by Congress are followed by deficiency appropriations in rapid sequence, and these again by Executive allocations. The O. P. A. espionage machinery, regulating and prohibiting domestic and interstate sales and distribution of food, requires a totalitarian army 10 to 100 times as large as the Federal machinery employed in prohibition days to check consumption of alcoholic liquors.

The Federal set-up in Washington is supplemented by 9 regional administrations. Attorneys and investigators under Federal direction, whether central or regional, regulate or prohibit food sales on a ration basis in all of the 3,030 counties of the 48 States. Even a farmer, theoretically, is not permitted to eat the chickens, pigs, butter, and eggs he raises, and his wife is not allowed to brown and grind green coffee without authority from Washington, D. C., and its totalitarian democracy.

Under the Federal espionage of food sales and so-called black marketing this so-called centralized planned democracy has a county attorney and a local F. B. I. in every county in the United States—not only to regulate retail and wholesale sales and prices but to regulate the food consumption, the shoes worn, and the gasoline, coal, ice, and clothing of 132,000,000 people. In Germany this might be called local government by the Gestapo, but here it is the New Deal—a new order of things in America.

Mr. President, I do not want Senators to think that I overlook the fact that there are persons—for example, old-age pensioners—who are in trouble and ought to receive aid in some form. However, to grant a subsidy to reduce the price of food to the millions of people, rich and poor alike, a great majority of whom are making more money than they ever made before in their lives, and meet the cost of it by borrowing money to be paid at some time in the future when our national income may not be so great as it is now, and when the chances will be against our having as much money with which to pay for food and pay taxes, is something which I do not think should be done.

If there are articles which we must have, and there is a desire to increase production, instead of paying a subsidy to increase production, all we have to do is to raise and fix the price. I have no objection to ceilings being placed on the prices of agricultural or other products, in order to stop the run-away of prices. People in various communities who are in need should be taken care of so that they will not suffer. It should be done, in my opinion, through the local agencies of the States and counties, who know the individual persons and are familiar with their needs. Certainly no one within reason can object to taking care of such persons.

What does it cost the Treasury and the taxpayer? What is the annual sum total cost of the O. P. A. set-up? A key to an approximate estimate is afforded in the testimony of the second O. P. A. Administrator, Prentiss Brown.

On page 144 of the 810-page volume of hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, he asked for \$177,335,000 to meet the salaries and expenses of 68,882 officials and clerical aides of the O. P. A. This would imply a per capita cost of O. P. A. personnel averaging something over \$2,500 apiece a year. Applying this unit personnel cost to the entire O. P. A. set-up of 119,000, both civil service and ration boards, calls for a total expenditure of \$297,500,000 for the taxpayer to meet.

It carries out and puts into concrete shape two theories of government:

First, the Harry Hopkins theory: "Spend and tax, spend and tax."

Mr. MOORE. And elect and elect.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; and elect and elect.

Second, the Thomas Jefferson indictment of George III:

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

It will be noted that the Thomas Jefferson idea was ratified by the signers of the Declaration of Independence, which for 150 years has been accepted as the foundation of the Constitution—indeed, 165 years before the Atlantic Charter.

It did include the "four freedoms," but it was created about 165 years before the Atlantic Charter was signed.

COST OF O. P. A. SET-UP VERSUS COST OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT UNDER THE FIRST 22 PRESIDENTS

If the cost of the O. P. A. set-up were only \$177,000,000, as asked for by Administrator Prentiss Brown to support 68,882 bureaucrats, the O. P. A. would cost more than double the entire cost of United States Government in 1861 under Abraham Lincoln, which was only \$66,500,000.

If, on the other hand, the O. P. A. set-up costs the \$297,000,000 estimated for support of 119,000 in 1944, it exceeds the total United States Government expenditure per annum under President Grover Cleveland, which in 1885-88 averaged \$260,000,000 per annum.

Even on a per capita basis, based on population, the O. P. A. set-up establishes a new mark in American "spend-and-taxation."

Under the Jefferson and Jackson administrations, which once were looked upon as democratic, the Government taxes to pay ordinary disbursements from the United States Treasury were less than 1.5 per capita.

The \$297,000,000 estimated to cover the salaries and expenses of the O. P. A.'s army of 119,000 employees amounts to a tax of \$2.22 per head on a population of 132,000,000 men, women, and children. Is this not too much to pay for the privilege of getting food prices in 1943 at 20 percent higher than in the last World War, in 1918?

The high cost of bureaucracy finds its best example in the high cost of the O. P. A. and subsidy. Yet the O. P. A. is only one among the one-hundred-odd alphabetic bureaus of the New Deal. One bureau is costing more than the entire United States Government under the Cleveland administration, and Grover Cleveland was once looked upon as a Democrat and twice elected as a Democrat. One bureau under the New Deal is costing more than twice the total cost of the United States Government under Lincoln in 1861.

The spend-and-tax theory of government may be good for the 3,000,000 bureaucrats who spend the taxes, and a good foundation for a totalitarian set-up, but does it conduce to democracy in America?

When the Commerce Department, inadvertently, "lets the cat out of the bag," and reveals that instead of a food price roll-back in the Nation's food bill there has been a roll-up-hill from \$12,500,000,000 in 1941 to \$17,000,000,000 in 1943—a 2-year roll-up of 35 percent—it knocks the last prop from under the world's biggest bureaucracy and this country's biggest bottleneck.

The first step toward post-war recovery and post-war democracy is to put an end to the totalitarian trend by abolishing the O. P. A. set-up and subsidy. Removal of this bureaucratic octopus from the back of American people will be a godsend to producer and consumer, the taxpayer, and free democracy. It may well be worth more for national defense than another victory in Italy or Africa, and it certainly is worth more for the general welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, I have brought these statistics and comparisons to the attention of the Senate to show the difference in the handling of the food situation in this war and the last war. I do not see any excuse for what has been done in handling this aspect of the domestic economy during the present war. As a matter of fact, the farmer does not get the subsidy. It goes to the processors, the middlemen, the retailers, and to the consumer. The spread in price between the wholesaler and the retailer, who handle the products of the farmer, has doubled if not trebled since the last war. It is they who get the subsidy.

Throughout the farming sections of the country we hear reference made to subsidies paid to the farmer in the triple A soil-conservation payments. But that is not a subsidy. The soil-conservation payments were provided in order to preserve for future generations the soil of the Nation which was being depleted; those payments were made to preserve future assets for the welfare of this country on the assumption that it was not fair for the farmer, because of low prices, to make a living by mining the soil and leave the soil when he was through with it in a depleted condition, and greatly inferior as a national asset.

I shall vote against the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, with all due respect to him and with all due respect to anyone who does not agree with my point of view. I think subsidies are inflationary. They are putting off the payment of the food bill until after the war is over, and the national income will not be so great as it is now.

We talk a great deal about appreciating the boys who are fighting all over the world and who are scattered in at least 50 various parts of the globe. The trouble is that while we have a war, many of us are afraid that it will cost us something. We talk about the sacrifice of the men who are fighting in the Army and Navy, but there is a feeling that we do not have to sacrifice anything. We want food and we want to obtain it as cheaply as we did in peacetime. We do not want to pay any more taxes than usual, but we want to make some money. I am not referring to any particular class of our pop-

ulation in any sense, but that is the feeling which is prevalent throughout the country.

We know that there are \$20,000,000,000 of currency outstanding. I asked a banker in Minnesota what he thought had become of it. He said, "I do not know; perhaps that is why so many people rent safe-deposit boxes, and it may be that they keep it there." Twenty billion dollars, which is about four times more than the average amount in circulation in normal times, is floating around. How did it get there? Is it escaping taxation? Is it money that has been made on the black market? In any event, in addition to our national debt, it is dangerous because of its inflationary possibilities. Sometime in the future I expect to address the Senate on the source of this currency, whence it comes, upon what it is based, and what its potential influence on inflation is. In itself it has inherent dangers, and it is increasing in volume all the time. That, however, is another subject which I shall discuss at another time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft].

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I rise simply to express the fervent hope that we may vote upon the pending amendment, which is the Taft amendment, very soon, and thereafter dispose of the bill today. I frankly say that I hope we can do that and adjourn over till Monday. I think that is the general feeling in the Senate, and I hope we may accomplish that purpose. I do not, of course, want to shut off the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the majority leader if there would be any chance, with the approval of the minority leader, of fixing an hour today when we might vote on the bill, so that we could take the action the Senator from Kentucky suggests?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would be agreeable to that, but I do not know. I think that if we can dispose of the Taft amendment, which is the only hump right now, we can very speedily dispose of other questions having to do with the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me there is another amendment which I propose to call up in behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette] and myself. It is an amendment which embodies the subject of the food stamp bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not know that. I have been told that the Senator was not going to offer that amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. There are a good many Members who desire to have it presented to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. In spite of that, I still hope we may dispose of the bill today.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I feel that the subject of subsidies has been adequately discussed, and that I can make very little contribution to what has already been said. I have, however, a few thoughts on the subject which I consider may tend possibly to bring clarity into a very confused situation.

Yesterday we heard discussed the proposition that a large segment of our population were underpaid. They are generally called the white-collar class. I am satisfied that the settlement of the subsidy question would make little or no contribution to the solution of that problem.

I should like to mention another thing. I feel that in the entire discussion, especially through the columns of the newspapers and over the radio, a large percentage of the workers of America have been given the impression that putting into effect a subsidy such as that we have heard discussed on this floor would afford them great relief. The Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have demonstrated quite clearly that the relief would be infinitesimal. What I am getting at is that, while in the discussions over the radio and in the columns of the press the farmers of the country have been almost damned, they have been misjudged.

I recently received a letter which I shall read into the RECORD. It comes from a farmer of my own State, and presents an almost tragic picture of a condition which I wish all the workers of America could comprehend and understand. Certainly, if prices are high—and they are high in some places—it is not due to the price the farmer is receiving. He is not receiving adequate compensation, as everyone knows, for many of the products he raises.

Let me read this letter:

DEAR SENATOR: As far as we here on the farms are concerned, we cannot understand where these housewives who were down to Washington, hollering about the high cost of living and wanting a subsidy, could be buying, or if their living costs were high, how or where they got that way.

Now listen to this:

Here at the farm we're getting 24 to 28 cents a dozen for eggs, eggs that cost us at least 45 cents a dozen to produce. The hens will bring us only 16 cents a pound. They'll average from 3½ to 4 pounds apiece. We paid 60 cents per chick when we bought them last May.

When we were told to raise more chickens for the country—

Our ears not only turn red, they take on a purple cast, when we think of the feed the chickens ate, to say nothing about the work we put in taking care of them.

The same example can be applied to nearly everything on the farm. So if living costs are high, the high price didn't originate on the farm.

I wish that idea could be broadcast over the radio to the listening public, so there would not be the opportunity by the politicians to create class hatred next fall between city groups and farmers. The way to bring out anything clearly is to throw light on the subject. I think

it was a great leader who said, "Give the people light, and they will find the way." But if we bring confusion into the picture, the people will not find the way.

Now I wish to continue reading from the letter:

We—

Meaning the farmers—

take what we get. Not others in America; they get what they ask for. Why, then, is not the farmer entitled to a price instead of a subsidy? And could it be that the high cost of wages has produced the high cost of living?

Just to give you an idea of the duties of a farm wife—

Mr. President, a woman is the writer of this letter. Many times on the floor of the Senate I have referred to the fact that in my State, and in the other States of the Middle West, women, many of whom are past middle age, are performing a great patriotic duty working on the farms. If anyone thinks there is any doubt about that, let him listen to the words this woman has written me on the subject, showing "Her Day" at work. Listen to this:

Just to give you an idea of the duties of a farm wife, due to the scarcity of labor and the price of it, if it were to be had, I'll give you a sketch of My Day.

Where did we hear that phrase before—"My Day"? I quote further:

Up at 5 o'clock. That's 4 by the sun. Milk five cows, get breakfast, do dishes and housework. Then to the woods to cut down 10 trees, pulling one end of a cross-cut saw. Home to get dinner and do dishes. To the barn to clean it and haul manure from 21 head of stock. Bed and feed them—

Meaning the stock—

and get them back in. Tend chickens and pigs. I won't elaborate. Back to the house to get supper and do dishes. Milk five cows, do my ironing. Take time to listen to the radio. Hear more about strikes, high cost of living, and wonder how this administration made such a mess of things. Retire at 10:30 real mad. Dumb, aren't I?

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALTIE VICK.

P. S.—Got no time and a half overtime, either. Lucky if I got time.

Mr. President, I shall read another letter, which throws some light on the situation. It is an appeal from an American 69 years of age, and if it does not strike a responsive chord in the heart of any man who listens to it, then I say he must be asleep.

Addressing me personally, the writer says:

DEAR ALEX: I am in a peculiar situation and need advice. You are in a position to know to whom I should write, and feel sure you will tell me.

On January—

I leave the date blank—

the foundrymen went on a strike here because they did not get an 8-cent an hour raise over the \$1.20 an hour which is the union scale.

Listen to this:

The machinists, of which I am a member, went out in sympathy, although they had promised not to go on strike until we win the war.

Of course I was thinking about my grandson, Bill. I pondered it over and over.

Something kept coming up in my mind, "Granddaddy, don't strike against me. Granddaddy, don't strike." Well, I refused. I was the only man in the shop for 3 days. Some of the men did not want to go out, but they just didn't have the guts."

Now that they are back some of them refuse to work with me.

The Government needs workers.

We must have men. When I went to work for the company in 1941 I told them I was able and willing to work up to 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, until we win. I have worked 7 days a week since. "I'm only 69." Would be glad to refer anyone to the manager.

I have bought with my earnings 16 \$100 bonds. I put my granddaughter through Iowa University. She graduated last January.

I have been a union man over 50 years.

I can't bring myself to strike against my own grandson who is in the service. I can't strike when we are at war. What am I to do. Write me please.

The writer of this letter, Mr. President, who is 69 years of age, who for 50 years was a union man, and whose grandson is in the service finds himself in a position of loyalty perhaps to some union leader, but also of loyalty to the Nation, and he will not strike, but when the men come back from striking they will not work with him. Contrast that with the woman whose letter I just read, who works from 4 in the morning until 8 or 9 at night, and turns on the radio and hears about these strikes.

Alec, what can I do?

Mr. President, how could I answer him? In one paragraph of my letter I wrote:

I have checked with various Government officials here who say they have no jurisdiction. It was, however, suggested that you go to your nearest conciliation service office and present the matter to them.

I told him I admired his attitude. I told him that back in 1939, on the floor of the Senate, I said we needed a definite labor policy. Every day I receive letters from laboring men in Wisconsin who are friends of mine who confirm that they want such a policy. A definite labor policy is needed now more than ever before.

But when it comes to the question of high prices of food attempt is made to induce people to believe that the farmer should be damned, when he works practically around the clock.

Mr. President, the two letters I have read present a situation in America of which we certainly must take cognizance. They are interrelated. The trouble with much of our legislation is that we bring up an idea and we try to handle that idea as if it were the only idea, whereas it is part of a series of ideas. So, Mr. President, I feel that if we are going to handle the subsidy idea properly, it must be done in such a way that that segment of our people that needs help will receive help, and that we should not particularly see to it that folks who do not need aid are assisted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I regret that the senior Senator from Ohio is not in the Senate Chamber at the moment. I should like to ask him a question. He made the statement that there was no difference between producer subsidies and support subsidies or consumer subsidies. I think there is all the difference in the world between a support price to guarantee to the farmer his price for production and a consumer subsidy paid to the consumer for help to buy agricultural products.

The Senator from Ohio said on the floor of the Senate that those who supported the measure of the Senator from Alabama were in a rather embarrassing position because if we supported this proposed measure we would support the general principles of subsidies, while cutting off the consumer subsidy which is prohibited by the bill. We do find ourselves in that position.

I am against a subsidy in lieu of a fair price. It is that type of subsidy that is outlawed in this bill. Last June we attempted to settle the subsidy question once and for all. Since that time a program has been announced whereby the producers of sugar beets and the producers of wool, and the producers of incentive crops will be paid a support price. If we were to vote against the bill because it provides for continuation of support prices, we would absolutely fail to keep faith with the farmer.

Mr. President, I do believe there is a great deal of difference between a support price subsidy and a consumer subsidy. If I understand it correctly, a support price is paid to the farmer to increase agricultural production, and when that production amounts to a surplus, then the Government steps in and pays the loss in order to pay the farmer the guaranteed price and thereby keep faith with the farmer in the promise made by the Government. Support price subsidy goes to the increase of agricultural production, and the whole theory of support prices has been to increase the production of agricultural products. But if I understand the Senator's amendment, on page 3, beginning where provision is made that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall have the right to buy in the open market, it can buy anything it wants to on which there is a support price, whether it is a surplus product or not, then after it is processed, either by contract or otherwise, the Corporation turns around and sells it to the consumer at a loss, the loss being the difference between the purchase price and the sale price, so to avoid an increased cost to the consumer. I think that is an entirely different thing from a support price, to increase agricultural production.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let us consider the sugar subsidy. What is it? A price for sugar beets was guaranteed, and the processor is paid the difference, in order not to pass the cost of sugar beets on to the consumer. That is exactly the same kind of subsidy as any other. In the matter of increasing production it is not a ques-

tion of whether a support price is paid; it is a question of the kind of support price that is paid. The higher the support price the greater the increase in production. As long as there is a support price, production is increased. My idea is to pay a subsidy only when it can be based on a support price. First, encourage production, and then determine in the best interest of the country as a whole what shall be done. If it is not desired to pass the increased cost on to the consumer, pay a subsidy.

Mr. WHERRY. My contention, Mr. President, is that instead of having the public pay the increased cost of production, the Government pays the loss as a consumer subsidy to reduce the cost of living.

Mr. TAFT. The farmer is paid, but if there is no subsidy the difference is passed on to the consumer. A support price, of course, is not the same as a subsidy. Senators talk about a support-price subsidy. There is no such thing except in what I have in my amendment. All subsidies have the effect of cutting down the margin between the producer and the consumer. One cannot be classified as a consumer subsidy and another as a producer subsidy. There is no such difference.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my understanding of the amendment, and especially now since the Senator has made his explanation, is that the consumer does not pay the increased cost of processing of agricultural products, but the Government does pay the loss. We are speaking of support prices. We are speaking of the Commodity Credit Corporation buying and selling at a loss. I think the Commodity Credit Corporation should do only one thing, and that is to pay the loss to a farmer if a crop is overproduced and a surplus arises, because the farmer has been guaranteed the support price. I think that is the only proper interpretation of support price.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The kind of subsidy the Senator is condemning is exactly the kind of subsidy we authorize when we put sugar in as an exception. The Government guarantees a certain price for beets, and that price could be allowed to go right on to the consumer in an increased price of sugar if it were desired to do so. Instead of that the Senator has approved and voted for a subsidy, and as a citizen of Nebraska, with his sugar-beet factories he is excepting sugar and saying, "With respect to sugar we will not pass that cost on to the consumer. We will pay the difference to the processor so that we do not have to pass it on to the consumer." He cannot distinguish between what he is doing with sugar and what any one of the other subsidies authorized by my amendment would do.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to say that I think the Senator from Ohio is somewhat wrong in calling the sugar subsidy

a farmer's subsidy. It seems to me it is a subsidy to insure national defense, to keep this country from becoming entirely dependent on overseas sources of sugar; because we know that sugar is absolutely essential in wartime.

I do not believe the subsidy is paid wholly for the benefit of the beet growers of the United States. They necessarily have to receive a higher price for their products because of the seasonal nature of the production.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am always appreciative of the advice and leadership and counsel of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and I wish to thank him for his remarks and comments about my knowledge of the program relative to sugar beets and meat. However, I wish to tell him that I think he has in his amendment exactly what I said; and, to use plain English, I think it is nothing more than a consumers' subsidy. I think it is the first time we have ever been asked legally to authorize a consumers' subsidy in this country. If we do, and if we put up \$950,000,000 now for it, they will be back here within 6 months asking for another \$950,000,000 to pay the grocery bills of the people. The Senate is now being asked to do it, under the theory that it is a support-price proposition. The only losses we should pay are those necessary to make good on the price guarantees the Government has made to farmers, rather than to pass on the benefit to the consumers, as a consumers' subsidy. The consumers are the ones who are and will be benefited, rather than the farmers.

In the amendment of the Senator from Ohio we have a consumers' subsidy. We do not have it in the bill as reported by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. While it is true—and I made the remarks before the Senator came into the Chamber—that I am called upon to support the sugar price support program, because I want to keep faith with the program that has been announced, I am against the consumers' subsidy.

The amendment of the Senator from Ohio provides for a consumers' subsidy, but such a subsidy is not provided for in the committee bill. That is why I shall support the committee bill and shall oppose the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not opposing a farmers' subsidy, but the committee bill does propose a consumers' subsidy. The purpose of paying it is to prevent passing on to consumers an increased price of sugar. The Senator from Nebraska has said there must be a support price for sugar beets. That is correct. The reason why a sugar subsidy is particularly defensible is that we do not want to increase the price of all imported sugar. So by subsidizing the sugar grown in this country we save the consumers about three times as much as we pay out. That is the justification for the sugar subsidy; and there is a similar justification for the oil subsidies.

But this would authorize a complete sugar subsidy. If the Government wanted to do so under the provisions of

the pending bill it could use \$100,000,000 or more to reduce the present price of sugar to consumers throughout the United States. That is what is authorized here. The Government could apply that to all foreign sugar if it chose to do so. I do not say the Government would do so, but the authority to do so is contained in the bill as reported.

Without my amendment, the bill is that broad, and it authorizes consumers' subsidies. It authorizes consumers' subsidies without limit as to those particular commodities; whereas in my amendment I have provided a very definite limit, and require that before that is done a support price to the farmers be put on, so as to protect the farmers. Under the bill as reported by the Senator from Alabama, it is not necessary to put on a support price for sugar or for wool or for vegetable oils. It is possible to subsidize the consumers, if that is desired.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what the Senator is doing by his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, let me inquire whether I correctly understood the Senator from Ohio to change his amendment again, so as to read "in line 15", as it did in the first place?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I left in the same language that is contained in the bill as reported by the Senator from Alabama. I think there is sufficient authorization without it, but I left that language in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Bailey	Hatch	Reynolds
Ball	Hawkes	Robertson
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Ho'man	Smith
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	Overton	Willis
George	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REYNOLDS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I do not know how he would vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. TOBEY's name was called). I again announce the absence of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] because of the serious illness of a member of his family.

Mr. WILLIS (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "nay." As I intend to vote the same way, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote, as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

I am advised that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—16		
Ball	Hatch	Vandenberg
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Murray	White
Davis	Pepper	Wiley
Downey	Radcliffe	
Ferguson	Taft	

NAYS—64		
Alken	Bone	Chandler
Andrews	Brooks	Chavez
Austin	Buck	Clark, Idaho
Bailey	Bushfield	Clark, Mo.
Bankhead	Eyrd	Connally
Barkley	Capper	Eastland
Bilbo	Caraway	Ellender

George	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Green	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	Millikin	Truman
Hawkes	Moore	Tunnell
Hayden	Murdock	Tydings
Hill	Nye	Wagner
Holman	O'Daniel	Wallgren
Kilgore	Overton	Walsh, N. J.
La Follette	Reed	Wheeler
Langer	Revercomb	Wherry
Lucas	Russell	Willis
McClellan	Shipstead	Wilson
McFarland	Smith	
McKellar	Stewart	

NOT VOTING—15

Brewster	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Jackson	Reynolds
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Gerry	McCarran	Scrugham
Gillette	McNary	Tobey

So Mr. TAFT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. REED and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me so that I may offer a perfecting amendment, which I am sure will take very little time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish to yield for the purpose of the Senator offering an amendment. I wish to offer an amendment myself.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Arkansas will offer an amendment which will involve considerable discussion and debate. I wish to offer an amendment which will take only a moment of the time of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to remind the Senator from Arkansas that he cannot retain the floor while business is being transacted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. For what purpose does the Senator from Kentucky ask me to yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to feel out the situation to see if we could not enter into a unanimous agreement to limit debate on the bill and any further amendments thereto, so that we might bring it to a conclusion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would yielding to the Senator from Kentucky result in my losing the floor?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not unless some Senator should make a point of order, and I certainly will not make it myself.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might enter into an agreement for a limitation of debate now, with the idea that we might dispose of the bill today. The present occupant of the

chair [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] shakes his head, indicating that he would not agree at this time to a limitation of debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that in his capacity as Senator he would have to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I have no purpose in further delaying the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is on the desk an amendment which has been offered by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself. I should like to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) Within a period of 120 days from the effective date of this act, and within each 6-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942), shall be adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes in farm labor costs (including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home grown), and other costs since January 1, 1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war and civilian purposes: *Provided*, That in determining the extent to which maximum prices shall be adjusted as provided herein, due consideration shall be given to historical and normal differentials customarily applied as between markets and regions: *Provided further*, That in no event shall maximum prices on milk and the products thereof be established below support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That where minimum prices to producers of milk have been regulated under any agreements or orders pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, the War Food Administrator is hereby directed, within the periods prescribed in this section (relating to the adjustment of maximum prices), to adjust such minimum prices to reflect adjustments in maximum prices determined and ordered pursuant to the provisions of this section. Except as expressly provided herein, nothing contained herein is intended, nor shall be construed to repeal, amend, or supersede the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

(b) In order to effectuate the purposes of paragraph (a) of this section, the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator are hereby directed to hold public hearings on a regional or market basis as the case requires. For such purposes there shall be utilized the hearing procedure and the personnel of the Food Distribution Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture established under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and such other personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration as may

be required. As soon as practicable after the completion of the hearing, but in any event within the periods specified in paragraph (a), the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator shall make public their joint findings based only on relevant substantial evidence of record at the hearing and the Price Administrator forthwith shall issue an order adjusting such maximum price or prices on the basis of and in conformance with such findings.

(c) Any person (within the meaning of section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended) who is adversely affected by the order of the Price Administrator may, within 30 days after the action adjusting such maximum price or prices, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the order be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part.

The War Food Administrator shall be made a party to the proceedings and upon service of the summons and complaint, the Price Administrator shall certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record upon which the order adjusting such maximum price or prices was based. The proceedings in such court shall be subject to all applicable provisions of section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; except, that wherever the term "Administrator" is used therein, it shall, for the purposes hereof, be construed to mean the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator: *Provided*, That during the pendency of such proceedings the Price Administrator may not modify or rescind his order adjusting such maximum price or prices except upon the basis of additional joint findings on evidence adduced pursuant to the order of the court. The provisions of this section shall terminate coterminous with the expiration of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this amendment is taken from Senate bill 1418, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself several months ago. After the bill was introduced the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on it, reported it favorably to the Senate, and it is now on the calendar.

Section 1 of the bill as originally introduced, which provided for an immediate adjustment of milk prices on the basis of 46 cents per hundredweight throughout the Nation, has been eliminated from the amendment now offered.

If the pending bill, which refuses to permit or give sanction to the continuation of the subsidy policy and program, should be enacted, then this amendment would rightfully belong to and would implement the legislation. It would set up the machinery immediately whereby the War Food Administration and the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration are directed within 120 days from the date of the enactment of this law to adjust on a regional or market basis, as the case may require, the prices of milk to the extent necessary to effectuate the following:

(1) Reflect changes in farm-labor costs (including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home-grown), and other costs since January 1,

1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war and civilian purposes.

The amendment would further require, Mr. President, that each 6 months thereafter the same process be followed, if necessary, in making an adjustment of milk prices so as to reflect these four goals. After the adjudication is made and the price is fixed, if any affected party is aggrieved or dissatisfied, the amendment then provides for a right of appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals, and pending that time the order, whatever it may be, cannot be changed.

The whole purpose of this amendment is to try to set up machinery so as to make it certain that dairy products shall be given the consideration to which they are entitled and that the producers of dairy products shall have fixed for their products by the Office of Price Administration and by the War Food Administrator a price which will reflect the increased cost of production, taking into account the factors I have already enumerated, covering changes which may have occurred since January 1941.

Mr. President, I think this amendment is important. The truth is that the dairy industry and the milk producers, possibly, have suffered more than any other agricultural interest with respect to the O. P. A. regulations and restrictions and price controls which have been invoked. The industry has been affected to such an extent that today, notwithstanding the increased demand for milk and for dairy products, national production has fallen off; as compared to the average production of other agricultural products for the period from 1935 to 1939, the dairy production has not at all kept pace.

Unless, Mr. President, something is done and done quickly—and in my judgment it will have to be done by the Congress—the shortage of milk products and dairy products will continue to increase. I am sure every Member of the Senate has received letters and information from home, as have I, to the effect that dairy herds are being put on the market, that the cost of producing milk today is equal to or above the O. P. A. price ceiling, and that it can no longer be produced at a profit, even including the subsidy on dairy products which is now paid, amounting in round numbers to \$441,000,000.

Certainly, if the subsidy is removed, as is contemplated by the pending bill, then, Mr. President, it is absolutely imperative that immediate steps be taken either through the processes set up by this amendment or by other means to reestablish a fair price for dairy products in order that this industry may survive.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

XC—98

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask the able Senator if it is not a fact in his State; as it is in the State which I have the honor in part to represent, that the current subsidy being paid is grossly inadequate to give a fair return to the dairy industry for the production of milk?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is wholly inadequate. In my opinion, Mr. President, in order to put the dairy industry on a competitive basis with other agricultural products and also on the basis of other prices, the present subsidy would have to be doubled and possibly trebled. That would be necessary in order to put this industry on a sound economic basis under present circumstances and conditions.

This proposed legislation, if it shall be favorably acted upon by the Senate and shall become a law, will have the effect of stopping the subsidy program, and certainly if that happens, considering the depressed condition of the dairy industry at this time, it is imperative, Mr. President, that action on this order be taken, that some machinery be immediately provided and legislative direction given to the Office of Price Administration and to the War Food Administrator to take action to adjust the prices so that this industry may survive.

Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment only briefly with the very able Senator from Alabama who is in charge of the bill. I hope there will be no objection to it. I hope that the committee can accept it or that the Senator from Alabama can accept the amendment, and that it may be adopted and become a part of the law, if the pending bill is enacted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that I do not understand that I have the power, either as author of the bill or as the one who was designated to report it to accept in a binding way any amendment to the bill after it is reported. I will simply say that if I had the power to accept it, I would do so very gladly. I think it is consistent with the philosophy I am supporting; it is supported by the milk producers of the country, and it seems to me to be sound in philosophy and theory. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I not only would consent, but I really hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall say just a word, because it is not necessary to say a great deal on the amendment.

I had hoped that we would not unloose the floodgates and bring about an increase in the cost of living in the country, because I think we would thereby cause grave injustice to the major part of our population.

It has always seemed clear to me, and I am sure it has certainly been clear to other Senators, that there is just one of three courses to be followed in respect

to the question before the Senate. Producers who are not getting a fair return will have to suffer unless we do one of two things, either give them an increase in the market prices of their products, or give them a subsidy out of the Federal Treasury. To my limited intellect there seems to be no way open except one of those two, if, by hypothesis, producers are not getting enough for what they grow.

Mr. President, that applies particularly to the dairy industry. Those engaged in that industry in my State of Florida are suffering, and I am sure my able colleague here will attest that fact. Hundreds of dairy cattle have been sold by dairymen, some of them for beef. I myself have seen fine Jersey cows, excellent milk cows, sold in the farmer's market, as many as half a dozen or a dozen, when they should have been furnishing milk for the people of my State. But the dairymen were being compelled to sell their cows because, due to the constant increase in the price of labor and in the price of feedstuffs, they could not remain in the dairy business. They have been here repeatedly attempting to obtain relief from the Government.

A few days ago a man came to Washington from Miami and brought with him his accounts with the supply house from which he bought his feedstuffs. He showed by his own books and records that he had \$4,000 in the bank the previous year, but when he came here he had not only exhausted his \$4,000 in the bank in trying to remain in the dairy business, but in addition he owed \$3,800, as I recall the amount, to the wholesale house which supplied him with feedstuffs; and he had the figures establishing that fact. It is not fair to take anyone's private property for public use without just compensation, and that is what we do if we require any person to continue to give his substance to the public good without being compensated for it. That, we must all admit, is not a desirable result.

The only point about which we disagree is as to the best way to help the producer who is not getting a fair return. About that question honest men may honestly differ. I voted in favor of the Maloney amendment. I believe in the subsidy. Other Senators feel equally strongly the other way, and I certainly respect the honesty and integrity of their opinions.

At this time the Senate has already acted in prohibition of the subsidy. So far as I am able to perceive, therefore, if the dairy people in my State and in other Senators' States are not to suffer, we have either to give them a subsidy or give them a greater return in the market place. I recall the time when 37 Senators appeared in the room of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the presence of Judge VINSON and told him about the plight of their States, and I see many of those Senators sitting in the Chamber at the present time. Yesterday afternoon, however, the Senate denied those engaged in the dairy industry the subsidy, and, therefore, if they are not to suffer I know of no redress

possible for them save to allow them an increase in the market place, and for that reason I shall support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senators from Arkansas and Mississippi.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that this amendment involves the Congress voting in favor of an increase in the price of milk. I do not think we should increase the price of any particular product. Whether we think the prices are wrong or right, if we proceed to pass on the price of milk, on the price of hogs, on the price of corn, and the price of every other product, there will be no end to the legislation in which we will become involved, even though we may agree that the price of milk should be higher. We have enacted a law, we have given to a board power to fix the price. I feel the same about an increase in the price of oil. It may be more than just, but I do not think Congress can undertake to pass on the price of one product after another, under the Price Control Act.

Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Where in the amendment does it say that prices must be raised?

Mr. TAFT. It says:

(a) Within a period of 120 days from the effective date hereof, and within each 6-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942) shall be further adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary—

Adding all costs which occurred since January 1—3 years ago—which probably represents an increase of 50 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senate provided that prices must be adjusted taking into consideration the difference in the cost of production from 1941 until the date it sets out the formula under which the price of milk is to be determined. Certainly the Senator favors an adequate food supply for the American people.

Mr. TAFT. Let me go back. I may misread the amendment. As I read it, this is what it provides:

Within a period of 120 days from the effective date hereof, and within each 6-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk—

That means the prices fixed on milk today by regional agreement or by the price control act. It continues:

and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942) shall be further adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes in farm labor costs (including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), feed prices (including all feed fed whether

purchased or home grown), and other costs since January 1, 1941.

The probable increase in costs in 3 years is somewhere between 25 and 50 percent, and we are taking prices which have been fixed today, not the prices which may have existed in January 1941, and saying we must add 2 or 3 years' increases in costs. It seems to me obvious that it will result in a 25-percent increase in the price of milk.

Mr. EASTLAND. Any business must have increased revenue when its costs increase, and if the cost of the production of milk increases, of course the price of milk must be increased.

We all admit that the dairy industry today is partially living on a subsidy. If we take off the subsidy, as it looks as if the Senate will do, under the bill, we must set up adequate machinery to give the dairy interests cost of production, or we will have a milk famine in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say a word. The purpose of the Eastland-McClellan amendment is to compel compliance with the price-control act of October 2, 1942, and the marketing agreement act of 1937. The Senator from Ohio certainly does not approve letting the executive departments "get by" without complying with those acts, does he?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all, but if those acts are on the statute books and are being disregarded, what is the use of passing another measure which makes the same provision? However, I would not have any particular objection if that were the fact, but as I read the amendment it does something very different. In effect, I think, it says we can take present prices and add to them the increase in costs. I may be mistaken, but that is the way the language reads to me. If the Senator merely wishes to add to the price as it was on January 1, 1941, the increase of cost which has occurred since that time, I have no objection. That is what the price control act provides, but I do not think that is what the amendment provides.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the Senator has no objection to the amendment, if that is what it does. It is too bad that we have to ask any executive agencies to comply with the law; nevertheless, it seems necessary to do so, because they have failed to do it. The purpose of the amendment is to direct them to comply with the two laws I have mentioned, and I believe the Senator from Ohio voted for them, and I assume he stands by them today.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from Mississippi will state that in his opinion the provision simply means that the increase over 1941, over what it was 3 years ago, shall be equal to the increase in cost for the same period, I have no further objection to the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator please repeat his question?

Mr. TAFT. I think I shall have no objection if the Senator will state that the

object is to provide that the price of milk shall be increased as much over what it was 3 years ago, January 1, 1941, as the cost of production of milk has increased during the same years.

Mr. EASTLAND. An increase has already been granted. The purpose is to fix the price of milk according to the formula set out in the amendment, which we think is equitable.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Mississippi. Would the amendment as drafted permit a board which was conducting a public hearing, to place the fair price of the milk as of the date the board was sitting, considering the four items which are to be found on the top of page 2 of the amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly so.

Mr. FERGUSON. If it were found that a reduction in price was justified it could be made under the provisions of the amendment, and if it were found that an increase in price was justified it could be made?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. But under the act of 1937 the price of milk can be set only in interstate commerce. We use that machinery with respect to milk produced and shipped in intrastate commerce.

Mr. TAFT. What confuses the issue, I think, is that the phrase "since January 1, 1941," is contained in the amendment. Why should that not be stricken out? What is wanted is an adjustment to meet the increased cost. When the matter is related to a particular date the cost is related to a particular date, but the change in price is not related to a particular date. The change in price is related to the existing price. I suggest that if the Senator eliminates from his amendment "January 1, 1941," I would have no objection to it.

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not see any point in eliminating that date. We have here the basis to start with. It takes in the whole period. While I cannot speak for the Senator from Arkansas, I for my part do not feel that it should be eliminated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that that date is fixed in the amendment as a basis from which to start. If no date is fixed from which to determine increase in cost, those charged with the determination could go back to 1920 or any other time. There must be some point beyond which they cannot go. In other words, there must be a basis, some date from which to proceed.

Mr. TAFT. This provision suggests the Little Steel formula. What is the Little Steel formula? It is that wages shall not be increased more than 15 percent over what they were on January 1, 1941. This has nothing to do with the price of milk on January 1, 1941. This simply says that in considering the change in the present price the increased cost since January 1, 1941, must be taken into consideration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would carry with it the increase in the cost of producing milk since that time. The increased cost since then would be determined. There has also been an increase in price since then, which would be considered. When the subsidy is taken off, of course, that would result in a decrease in the price which the farmer or the dairyman receives for his product, and that would have to be taken into account. The price would have to be adjusted on that basis.

Mr. EASTLAND. The date, January 1, 1941, is fixed in order to take into account the abnormal cost due to the war, and also increases in prices.

Mr. TAFT. But a part of that cost may have already been taken into account by the increase in price.

Mr. EASTLAND. All the amendment does is to utilize the machinery which has already been set up, to take into consideration in fixing the price of milk the increased cost due to the war emergency since the date fixed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It does not necessarily mean that the price must be increased one cent, but that in adjusting the price to effectuate the purposes as set forth, those charged with the determination of the matter are directed to take into account the increased cost since that time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the next few months if the costs decrease, then the price of milk would decrease.

Mr. TAFT. But I understand the Senator thinks the amendment means that in fixing the price, consideration must be taken of what the price of milk was on January 1, 1941.

Mr. EASTLAND. It would take into consideration, in fixing the price, increases since that date.

Mr. TAFT. Is it intended to relate the increase to the increase in the price of milk from that which existed on January 1, 1941?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. If that is the meaning of the proposal, I have no objection to it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I desire to say to the distinguished Senators who have offered the amendment that I think the point being made by the Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. The amendment as it now reads provides that to the maximum price of milk in the last 3 years there shall be added the increase in the cost of production during that period.

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. DOWNEY. The amendment certainly provides that the maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk products shall be taken, and then, beginning with them, adjustment shall be made to reflect the changes in farm-labor costs over the period of time since January 1, 1941.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Adjusting a price does not mean to increase a price. The price is adjusted taking those things into account.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee beginning on page 9, line 11, and extending down to and including line 23, on page 10—being section 3—it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS AND AUTHORITY PURPOSES

SEC. 3. It is hereby declared to be in the interest of national defense and security and necessary to the effective prosecution of the present war and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the civilian population, and the morale of those members of the armed forces who have dependents among the civilian population, that the limited supplies of food presently available for civilian consumption be equitably distributed among the various sections of the Nation and among persons in the various income groups, and that the means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet be placed so far as possible within the reach of every person in the Nation. It is further declared that the operation of the national food-allotment plan, as provided in this act, is a desirable and effective method of accomplishing the purposes hereinabove set forth.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. As used in this act—

(a) The term "Director" shall mean the Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration charged with the establishment and operation of the food-allotment plan.

(b) The term "household" shall mean one person who alone, or a group of two or more persons who at a common table, customarily consume food prepared by or for him or them in a home or noncommercial nonpenal institution. Households shall be classified for the purposes of this act according to number of members and monthly income. Such income classification shall be according to \$10 levels.

(c) The term "basic food allotment" per person, shall mean the following amounts of food per person per week or the equivalent thereof in nutritional value and approximate cost as determined by the Director:

Milk, or its equivalent in cheese, evaporated milk, or dry milk, 5 quarts.

Potatoes and sweetpotatoes, 4 pounds.

Dry beans, peas, and nuts, 8 ounces.

Tomatoes and citrus fruits, 1 pound 8 ounces.

Leafy, green, or yellow vegetables, such as green cabbage, kale, snap beans, and carrots, 1 pound 8 ounces.

Other vegetables and fruits, 2 pounds 5 ounces.

Eggs, 4 (number of eggs).

Meat, poultry, and fish, 1 pound 8 ounces.

Flour and cereals, 4 pounds 7 ounces.

Fats and oils, 14 ounces.

Sugars, sirups, and preserves, 12 ounces.

(d) The term "normal food expenditures" shall mean the amount of money customarily expended for the purchase of food plus the money value of home-produced food consumed by households of a specific size and

income classification during a specified period of time.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FOOD-ALLOTMENT PLAN

SEC. 5. The War Food Administrator created by Executive Order No. 9322 is hereby authorized and directed to establish and administer a national food allotment plan in accordance with the provisions of this act under the supervision of a Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration. Such plan shall provide for the issuance to eligible households, according to need and free of charge, of food-allotment coupons of prescribed monetary values and in such form as may be approved by the Director. Coupons so issued shall be transferable by the recipient thereof to mercantile establishments registered in accordance with the provisions of this act in exchange for food or food products of equal value at the prices currently prevailing in the establishment of the transferee and shall be redeemable at face value upon presentation to the Treasury by any authorized transferee thereof. Such coupons may be transferred by such transferee and accepted in payment for food or food products purchased by him, or deposited by such original or subsequent transferee with a banking institution authorized by the Director to receive the same for redemption as hereinafter provided.

ELIGIBILITY OF HOUSEHOLDS

SEC. 6. (a) The determination with respect to the eligibility of households to participate in the national food allotment plan shall be made on the basis of the number of persons who are members thereof and their monthly rate of income. Individual households shall be certified only upon the voluntary application of a member thereof. A household shall be eligible to participate in the national food allotment plan and receive food-allotment coupons: *Provided*, That households of the same size and income classification, considered as a group, are found by the Director, on the basis of factual studies conducted under his supervision, to have normal food expenditures less than the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment of such households.

(b) For the purpose of determining eligibility and the value of coupons issuable, as provided in section 5 of this act, the Director shall determine semiannually in the manner specified in subsection (a) of this section, the normal food expenditures and the reasonable cost, according to the food prices collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, of the basic food allotment for households within each size and income classification. Such normal food expenditures shall be stated in terms of the national average, but the Director may, if he deems it necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act of securing equitable distribution of food supplies, provide for regional differentials with respect to the reasonable cost of the basic food allotments.

VALUE OF FOOD ALLOTMENT COUPONS ISSUABLE

SEC. 7. (a) Each household certified as eligible shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to receive food-allotment coupons of a value which, added to the normal food expenditures for households of the same size and income classification, as determined by the Director, shall equal the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment for a household of that size as so determined. The value of coupons to be issued for each period shall be adjusted to the nearest whole dollar.

(b) If the Director finds that the funds available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of this act are insufficient to meet the full amount of the difference between normal food expenditures and the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment for all eligible households participating in the

plan, he shall establish a percentage of the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment which can be attained for all participants out of the funds available, and shall cause food-allotment coupons to be issued to each participating household of a value which, added to the normal food expenditures as aforesaid, shall equal the established percentage of the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment of a household of that size.

(c) Except for variations based on regional differentials authorized under section 4 (b) of this act, all households of the same size and income classification shall be entitled to receive food-allotment coupons of the same value. Except for adjustments to the nearest whole dollar as provided in subsection (a) of this section, in no event shall coupons be issued to any household of a value in excess of that which added to the normal food expenditures for a household of the same size and income classification shall equal the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment for a household of that size as determined by the Director.

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

SEC. 8. There shall be no discrimination against any household with respect to eligibility, classification, participation, or issuance or utilization of food-allotment coupons under the provisions of this act by reason of race, religious creed, national origin, citizenship, political affiliations or beliefs, occupation, employment, or other tests, except as provided for in this act and as necessary to insure general fairness and equity in the application of this act.

PRESERVATION OF STANDARDS

SEC. 9. No moneys herein or hereafter appropriated for the purposes of this act shall be expended in lieu of Federal, State, or local expenditures customarily made for the direct benefit of households within the income groups found eligible to receive food-allotment coupons. Present standards for the payment, and payments, of social security and other types of assistance shall not be made less favorable to the recipients, or applicants for such assistance, by reason of the operation of the food-allotment plan.

DETERMINATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF ELIGIBLES

SEC. 10. (a) The Director shall designate appropriate State, local, and private agencies and ration boards where feasible to receive applications to participate in the food-allotment plan, to determine the eligibility of such applicants for food-allotment coupons, and to certify to him the names of those found eligible, together with such relevant data concerning the size and income classification of the households so certified as may be necessary to determine the value of the coupons to be issued to the applicant and such other information as may be necessary to the efficient administration of the food-allotment plan. The Director may reimburse such agencies so designated for reasonable expenses incurred in connection with the work performed by them.

(b) When the Director finds upon investigation that appropriate State, local, or private agencies are not available in any State or community, he may establish local offices and employ suitable personnel to receive applications, determine eligibility, and certify eligibles as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Each applicant shall furnish such information with respect to the size and income of the household of which he is a member as may be required by the Director and necessary to the determination of eligibility and of the value of food-allotment coupons to which such household is entitled. In determining the income classification of a household income in cash and in kind shall be considered in accordance with regulations

issued by the Director. When two or more adult members, other than husband and wife, contribute to the support of a household, an equitable portion of the income of any such member other than the natural head of the household shall be deemed to constitute income of the household in accordance with regulations issued by the Director.

(d) The Director shall establish appropriate procedures for appealing from the determination as to eligibility and the value of coupons issuable.

(e) The eligibility of each participating household and the value of the coupons to which it is entitled shall be redetermined and certified at least twice in each 12-month period in accordance with rules and regulations issued by the Director.

ISSUANCE

SEC. 11. The unit for issuing food-allotment coupons shall be denominations of 10 cents and increasing denominations thereof. The Director, or his designated issuing agents, shall issue coupons in such manner, and at such times and places, as the Director may determine, taking into consideration efficiency of administration and the convenience of those entitled to receive such coupons.

REDEMPTION OF FOOD-ALLOTMENT COUPONS

SEC. 12. (a) The Director shall provide for redemption of food-allotment coupons exchanged for food and food products through the cooperation of the Treasury Department, Post Office Department, the General Accounting Office, and banking institutions throughout the Nation. He shall designate banking institutions to accept coupons from sellers of food at retail and wholesale. Institutions so designated shall pay at time of presentation in cash or by credit to a demand deposit the full value of all coupons presented to them.

(b) Banking institutions accepting coupons as provided in subsection (a) of this section and other authorized transferees may present such coupons for redemption at audit offices of the War Food Administration, and the General Accounting Office shall arrange to conduct the necessary audits of such claims at such offices, thereupon releasing the coupons to the Director for reissuance. Approved vouchers covering such claims shall then be forwarded to regional disbursing offices of the Treasury Department for payment.

(c) The Director may contract to reimburse banking institutions designated to receive food-allotment coupons for their reasonable expenses incurred in acting as such depositories.

REGISTRATION OF FOOD DEALERS

SEC. 13. The Director shall provide by regulation a simple method for the registration of mercantile establishments selling food and food products at wholesale or retail which desire to be authorized to receive food-allotment coupons in exchange for food and food products. Such registration shall constitute authority so to receive food-allotment coupons.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 201. (a) The Director may, subject to the civil-service laws and the approval of the War Food Administrator, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Director may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local and private agencies, and may utilize and establish such regional, local, or other agencies and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Director in any case in any court. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers

and employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

(b) The principal office of the Director shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place.

(c) The Director shall have authority to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; for law-books and books of reference; and for paper, printing, and binding) as he may deem necessary for the administration and enforcement of this act. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the purchase of supplies and services by the Director where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$250. Total administrative expenditures of all types shall not exceed 5 percent of the funds appropriated for the purposes of this act.

(d) The Director may, from time to time, issue such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

INVESTIGATIONS, RECORDS, AND REPORTS

SEC. 202. (a) The Director is authorized to make such studies and investigations and to obtain such information as he deems necessary and proper to assist him in prescribing any rule or regulation under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and the rules and regulations thereunder.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

SEC. 203. As a part of the food-allotment plan, the Director shall provide, in cooperation with existing agencies of the Federal, State, or local governments, or private persons or groups, for improving the buying habits, food-utilization techniques, and food-preservation methods of the participants in the food-allotment plan.

SUSPENSIONS

SEC. 204. (a) The Director is authorized to suspend from participation in the food-allotment plan any State or area, if he finds after due notice and opportunity for hearing that any agency of such State or area serving as a certifying agent under the provisions of section 8 of this act (1) has knowingly violated any provision of this act or of any rule or regulation issued by him under the provisions of this act or has knowingly certified as eligible households not entitled to such certification or submitted inaccurate data with respect to size or income of households certified and (2) is likely to fail to comply in the future with the provisions of this act and the rules and regulations issued by him or to continue such unauthorized certifications or submission of inaccurate data.

(b) The Director is authorized to suspend from participation in the food-allotment plan any State or area, if he finds after due notice and opportunity for hearing that expenditures customarily made are being withheld, or that standards of payment or payments have been made less favorable, by such State or area, or by agencies thereof, contrary to the provisions of section 7 of this act.

(c) No State or area shall be suspended in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section except by written order of the Director signed by him.

(d) The Director is authorized and directed to provide by rules and regulations for the suspension from participation in the food-allotment plan of any registered food dealer, participating household, or banking institution found by him, or by any officer or employee designated by him, to hear and determine suspension proceedings, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, to have violated any provision of this act.

COUNTERFEITING OF FOOD-ALLOTMENT COUPONS

SEC. 205. Whoever shall falsely make, alter, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be falsely made, altered, forged, or counterfeited any food-allotment coupon or coupon similar thereto for the purpose of obtaining or receiving, or of enabling any other person to obtain or receive, directly or indirectly, from the United States or any of its officers or agents, any money or other thing of value, and whoever shall transfer or utter as true, or cause to be transferred or uttered as true, any such false, forged, altered, or counterfeited food-allotment coupon or coupon similar thereto, with intent to defraud the United States, or any mercantile establishment, banking institution, or person, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS
REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 301. The Director shall render, through the War Food Administrator, semiannual reports to Congress describing the operations of the food-allotment plan, including the following: Number of eligibles and participants, by the various classes of households established; the reasons for nonparticipation of eligibles; effect of the food-allotment plan on the expenditure habits of participants; extent to which the plan increases purchases of foods of various types and other kinds of goods and services, for the various classes of households; benefits derived from the plan for the different types and groups of food sellers, wholesalers, processors, and producers; extent of improper use of food-allotment coupons; changes in relief payments, social-security payments, and other types of income of the various classes of eligibles; the amount and type of administrative expenditures incurred.

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS PROHIBITED

SEC. 302. It being the policy of Congress as provided in title I of this act to provide a national food allotment plan as a means of safeguarding the general welfare against excessive price rises and inflationary tendencies in the existing war emergency, no funds appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of, any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, shall be used for subsidy or other payments with respect to the production, processing, distribution, or other handling of any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 303. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

TERRITORIAL APPLICABILITY

SEC. 304. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

SEPARABILITY PROVISION

SEC. 305. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 306. This act may be cited as the "National Food Allotment Act."

TERMINATION OF ACT

SEC. 307. The provisions of this act, and all rules, regulations, orders, and requirements

thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such rules, regulations, orders, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

SEC. 308. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$500,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am quite in favor of the Bankhead bill with its limitation on subsidies, but I have felt from the beginning that the Senate would be very vulnerable if it enacted such a bill with its prohibition of subsidies without doing two things, one of which is to adopt an amendment such as we have adopted, which would provide for reimbursing farmers for any loss which they might sustain by reason of the abolition of subsidies and permit them to continue in production. In addition, I cannot vote to deprive the very poor people of our country of even the small amounts they would receive from a general subsidy, without making every effort I can make to provide some means of insuring that they have the food they must have in order to maintain their health.

The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and myself was formerly introduced as Senate bill 1331. Hearings have been held on that bill and have been completed. It is unfortunate that the printing of the hearings has been delayed for some days at the Printing Office. I do not know why the hearings have not as yet been printed and are not available today, but they are not.

However, that bill, as now submitted in the form of an amendment to the pending bill has had several days of hearings. There appeared before us representatives of farm organizations who endorsed the bill, at least in a conservative manner. Among those were representatives of the Federation of Milk Producers, of the Association of Farmer Cooperatives, and of the Grange. There also appeared before the committee, in opposition to the bill, representatives of various labor organizations, including the C. I. O. and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. I think one other labor organization also submitted a brief in opposition to the bill.

Opposition was expressed by the American Public Welfare Association, who thought the bill might interfere with its appropriations and might prevent it from obtaining larger appropriations, if the low-income people were temporarily taken care of by some other means. I also think I should say that the Social Security Board opposed the bill on the ground that it should have larger appropriations to enable it to distribute more cash among the people of the country.

Mr. President, in these days of high wages, high prices, and large profits, when money is spent freely and often

recklessly, when there is competitive bidding in the black market for insufficient quantities of certain foods, we are likely to get the impression that everyone is well off. I wish this were so. I wish all persons had adequate means to support themselves comfortably; but that is not the case.

Millions of our American citizens do not have an income sufficient to enable them to maintain their health—to say nothing of living in luxury or even in comfort. Among these are 2,200,000 recipients of old-age pensions; 700,000 persons drawing old-age and survivors' insurance under the social-security program; about 1,000,000 disabled veterans drawing pensions or disability compensation, or their widows and dependent children; over 150,000 retired and disabled firemen, policemen, State and municipal employees; dependent children receiving aid through Federal and State welfare funds, to the number of 739,000; blind people to the number of 53,000; and many persons living on a fixed income too low to enable them to buy the food they need.

At the time the food-allotment bill was written, there was an indeterminate number of dependents of the 9,000,000 to 10,000,000 men in our armed forces who would have been eligible under the provisions of this plan. These have since been better provided for by the increase in servicemen's allotment, but no doubt there is still a large number who would be eligible.

I should like to call attention to the average amounts received as pensions or compensation by the veterans of our wars or their dependents:

One hundred and forty thousand veterans of the Spanish-American War average \$57.80 a month.

Four hundred and twenty-six thousand veterans of World War No. 1 are drawing \$39.02 a month, and we already have over 8,000 veterans of World War No. 2 drawing an average of \$40 a month.

The widows and children of deceased veterans of the Civil War average \$37.70 a month; of the Spanish-American War, \$30.56; of World War No. 1, \$44.11; and of World War No. 2, \$48.42.

An average of \$34.09 per month is being paid to the families of 13,449 men in the armed forces who died from service-connected disability in peacetime.

I would add to these numbers which I have stated several million low-income workers the amounts of whose pay checks have not increased during the years of the present war. These facts and figures will certainly bring home to us the realization that justice, mercy, and income are not being equitably dispensed. Rising costs of living at a rate comparable to the increased costs during other wars make the difficulties of these millions of low-income citizens more serious.

Most of the low-income people today are deserving. A few years ago chiselers and small-time racketeers were to be found in considerable numbers among those requesting assistance from their Government or other sources. Today the chiselers have pretty much disappeared. They would not be interested in the

small-time income which this amendment would provide. I think that is one reason why the group this amendment is intended to help is so silent. They are not organized, and they cannot demand. They are patient, law-abiding, patriotic citizens who deserve earnest consideration, just as much as do the groups which are organized and speak loudly through their spokesmen.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to read excerpts from a few letters I have just received from the kind of people who would receive some assistance from the amendment, if it should be agreed to.

I read first a letter from North Carolina, written by a resident of the home town of the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]:

DEAR SIR: I am one of the group you are trying to help. I have six children, three in school, three at home, too small to go to school. I am receiving \$30 a month of A. D. C.

That is Aid to Dependent Children—

My husband lost his mind and is in the State asylum. I am really having a time. I hate to complain about prices, but God knows they are out of sight. I cannot feed and clothe them, and I don't want to give a one of them away. I don't want them to steal and do the wrong thing, to survive. I am praying that God will spare you to get that bill through. I hope it will pass.

We poor people are the hardest hit. I am sure you will make a lot of people feel more like living if that food-stamp bill passes.

I will not state the names of any of the persons who wrote the letters I read at this time.

I read now a letter which comes from Utah, from the home of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Senator AIKEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: We note with some hope your suggestions for relief for those of low-income groups. Prices go up but not our income. I am an ex-physician of 70 years, and had to retire on account of ill health. Our income last year for myself and wife was under \$500. How can we live respectably on that? Who says there are no more low-income groups? I think Senators TAFT and BUSHFIELD should look around and figure this out. The plan suggested to help pay our living expenses is the first we have seen to give us any hope. After a life of 45 years of helping the sick and living well, this comes pretty hard, as you must know. They should be told of the many doctors and lawyers and other professional men in this class.

I read now an excerpt from a letter coming from a resident of New York City:

I am a retired United States customs clerk, having performed 26 years and 4 months' service in the United States Appraisers Customs Service, now at No. 201 Varick Street, New York City, first as opener and packer, then clerking for 23 years in the English cloth and manufactured clothing import duties; as to rating under various examiners—until my compulsory retirement by law as to 70 years of age, on July 5, 1939—record "Very good."

I was in the forties at my entry in the Service, and shortly after my entry the pension of Federal employees law came into effect as to \$1,200 per year, 70 years of age, 30

years' service, less 2½ percent of salary and later to 3½ percent for same.

Being not able to make the 30 years, my monthly pension check is only \$86.39 instead of \$100. The question is, How are the wife and I to get along on \$86.39 per month?

My rent is \$43 per month. We allow \$45 budget for eats—30 days at \$1.50 per day—plus \$5 per month gas and electric. These three items equal \$93. Plus doctor, medicine, and shoes, and clothing, etc. How to do it, I don't know. Dear Senator if, perhaps, you could amend the \$86.39 to the \$100 check, we would try and pull out, as my wife is very economical. There are very few who do not leave the service under 30 years' service, and as you can readily see it was no fault of mine. Please try and help us.

Here is a letter from Kodak, Tenn.:

KODAK, TENN., January 15, 1944.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I have just read in the Knoxville News Sentinel, a Scripps Howard paper, where you have introduced a stamp campaign to increase the living of low-class earners. I am 82 years old and was born on May 23, 1861. My wife—June 18, 1877. We are trying and have raised her granddaughter who is 13 years old, and am keeping her in school every day her health will permit, on the pitiful sum of \$23.90 per month we get as an old-age assistance. I have to pay \$7.50 per month for a shack that leaks and is open as a barn. I cut wood out of fence rows and carry all the way from 100 to 3,000 yards on my shoulder to keep fires to burn. I feel that it would be a great Godsend if someone would come to our aid, and not be like some of our visitors who try to look after us and tell us we ought to live fine on \$23.90 per month. So thanking you again for your effort I beg to remain as ever,

Yours respectfully,

I shall not read anymore of these letters. There are plenty of them, for there are millions of such people all over the United States. I should like to place more such letters in the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator an estimate of how many million?

Mr. AIKEN. I will come to that very shortly.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator said there were millions. I wondered how many millions.

Mr. AIKEN. Millions of people in the United States do not have enough to eat, and do not have sufficient means to keep warm.

Mr. TAFT. I am asking if there is an estimate of the number.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall come to that as soon as I can.

It has been said that the distribution of food allotment coupons would be humiliating to some of those who are forced by necessity to request them.

I presume there are those of whom this is true. I am glad that we still have proud people in our country. The fact is, however, that under the old stamp plan between 60 percent and 80 percent of those eligible made application for stamps.

The fact is that pride has not caused some of our higher income persons to decline subsidies. Everywhere all through our land wartime bonuses are

being paid and there is no record of broken pride. Even the employees of the United States Government have received bonuses of \$300 and up to help out on the cost of wartime living, and I have heard no loud cries of resentment yet—not even from my own office. The people whom this amendment is designed to help are the ones who unfortunately cannot get cash bonuses or increases in salaries. A large part of them are unable to work for one reason or another. Many of them work in civilian industry which has been shut down because of the war. They live in small towns. Their income is cut off. Thousands are borderline cases who may have to call upon their local government for help in the near future. Which will humble them most—to accept a wartime bonus to help out on the cost of living as higher paid groups are being helped, or a listing in the books of public relief and charity, which they do not deserve? During the great depression I saw people living under wretched conditions and doing without proper food to keep from going on relief. Most of them, however, accepted the stamp plan.

It is the purpose of this amendment to provide equitable distribution of food in order to maintain health and productive capacity during wartime among low-income consumers. The amendment has been generally referred to as the stamp plan. It should not, however, be confused with the old stamp plan which was used partly as a relief measure and partly as a means of utilizing surplus farm commodities.

This plan provided for in this amendment attempts to make the best possible use of the experience gained through the application of the old stamp plan and at the same time eliminate the difficulties of that plan.

I wish to make it clear that the amendment would not create any new organization for administering a food allotment plan. It would be under the direct supervision of a deputy director of the food distribution administration, but the actual application will be in the hands of existing State, local, and, in some instances, private agencies.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the Senator's amendment, what is the date of expiration of the plan?

Mr. AIKEN. Six months after the war. The bill as drawn carried in the preamble a statement that it could be used after the war for distribution of farm surpluses, which some of us felt would then exist. That part of the preamble, however, has been deleted.

Because of regional variations of conditions, it is advisable to have this plan administered by persons familiar with each locality. For this same reason, provision is also made for regional differences with respect to the reasonable cost of the basic food allotments.

Administrative costs are to be paid by the Federal Government and must not exceed 5 percent of the funds appropriated. The amendment sets no minimum income for determining eligibility be-

cause this amount would vary according to the variation in living costs. It does, however, require a redetermination of such costs every 6 months.

The measure of eligibility is the insufficiency of normal food expenditures of households of various sizes and income classifications to meet the cost of basic food allotment.

A basic food allotment is defined as the amount of various kinds of food per person per week representing a minimum adequate diet. I must confess that the diet as defined in paragraph (c) of section 4 of the amendment is a pretty good diet for a minimum. The diet prescribed has been worked out by the most efficient home economists. It undoubtedly smacks of idealism because it does prescribe what is supposed to be a perfect diet. It is probably a better diet than most persons enjoy today, even though they can amply afford it.

The percentage of this diet which would be given to people in distress would be entirely dependent upon the amount which the Appropriations Committee and the Congress might be willing to appropriate. We have set up in the amendment what is designed to be a perfectly balanced diet. However, I do not think any of us believe that the time will come in the near future when everyone in the United States will be enjoying a perfect diet. However, it is a mark to shoot at. It should be our aim to see that everyone enjoys an ample, well-balanced diet, and we might as well aim for the bull's-eye in hopes that we may run up a better score than we have up to now.

The strength of a nation depends largely upon the health of its people, and health depends upon an adequate amount of the right kind of food.

The War Food Administration, which has approved this food-allotment plan in principle, has estimated that the current average cost of the basic food allotment as outlined in the amendment would be approximately \$646 a year for an average family of four persons. It appears that the average family of four, spending \$646 a year for food, should be receiving an average income of not less than \$2,350 a year.

This would vary according to the section of the country in which the people lived. The amendment is elastic enough to take care of such variations. The \$3,000,000,000 figure is the maximum amount that could be spent under this amendment if every person receiving less than \$2,500 per year for a family of four received every dollar's worth of coupons to which he might conceivably be entitled. In other words, \$3,000,000,000 would not provide a perfect diet for every person in the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There seem to be two conflicting provisions. Section 303 provides as follows:

SEC. 303. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

Section 308 provides as follows:

SEC. 308. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$500,000,000, or so much thereof

as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that this amendment in Senate bill 1331 is made over. I do not doubt that there are some technical errors in it, but I do not doubt the ability of a conference committee to correct them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What I wanted to ask was whether it is intended to limit the appropriation to \$500,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. It is intended to limit the amount of the authorization to \$500,000,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to suggest to the Senator that he modify his amendment by striking out that section.

Mr. TAFT. Section 303.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In writing it over and offering it as an amendment, apparently inadvertently that provision was left in.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Wisconsin that I gladly accept any modifications which will correct any purely technical and unintentional errors in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to modify his amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified as indicated.

Mr. AIKEN. It is rather startling to learn that there are as many as 60,000,000 people in this country receiving an income at a rate less than \$2,500 per year for a family of four.

In some large areas of our country over 99 percent of the people would undoubtedly be eligible for assistance if Congress should choose this criterion. However, they certainly would not be eligible under the \$500,000,000 limitation.

It goes without saying that Congress would not, at the present time at least, use these figures as a yardstick in applying the provisions of the act. The amendment provides, however, that if sufficient funds are not appropriated to make up the full difference between normal food expenditures and the cost of the basic food allotment, the food allotment coupons may be used to supplement normal purchases in such a way as to enable participating families to buy a certain percentage of the basic amounts. A reduction in the allowance for food coupons would also mean a decrease in the number of eligible families and persons.

If we should consider that eligibility should be based on a minimum income of \$2,500 for a family of 4, we would find that 60,000,000 people would be eligible to receive food-allotment coupons to some degree. If every one of these—both

families and single individuals—took advantage of their eligibility and received the fullest amount of coupons that could be allotted, the total cost is estimated to be \$3,000,000,000.

Assume that the Congress decides to allow only 90 percent of the full basic diet, which would probably still be as good as or better than that enjoyed by the members of this body. The number of persons eligible would drop from 60,000,000 to 50,000,000, while the cost would drop from \$3,000,000,000 down to \$2,300,000,000, still assuming there would be 100 percent participation by all eligibles. But it is not likely that, even though authorized, the Congress would even appropriate for 90 percent of a full basic diet. It is more likely that a figure of 60 percent would be chosen, in which case the number of persons eligible would drop to 22,800,000 and the total cost would be about \$600,000,000 if everyone eligible participated fully.

However, experience has shown that when the stamp plan was in effect, only 60 to 80 percent of the low-income people took advantage of it.

Assuming that 70 percent of those eligible take advantage of this food-allotment program and receive coupons to enable them to enjoy a 60-percent diet, the total cost would amount to \$420,000,000. This amount would substantially raise the living standards of 16,000,000 of our lowest income people and protect them against actual want.

These 16,000,000 people are the ones who are in real need and should have their meager income supplemented in order to maintain their health and efficiency and a reasonable degree of security and happiness. These are the people who average \$1,100 a year or less for a family of four.

If we wish to go down still further and subsidize only to the amount of 50 percent of the basic diet, we would find that 19,600,000 persons eligible could be taken care of at a cost of \$389,000,000 if all participated or \$282,000,000 if 70 percent participated.

It is obvious that the really low income group of our country could be raised from a state of want, though not to a state of luxury, by any means, for approximately \$400,000,000 a year.

This amendment is not a relief measure, and it will not relieve States, counties, or municipalities of the duties with which they are now charged.

One of the witnesses before the committee testified that persons of low income should call on their local welfare agencies when they are in need. I advised him that it was the purpose of this bill to keep such persons from having to call on their local welfare agencies because a large percentage of them are not to blame for their present situation and should not be humiliated by being obliged to go "on the town," as we say in New England.

Section 9 of the amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 9. No moneys herein or hereafter appropriated for the purposes of this act shall be expended in lieu of Federal, State, or local expenditures customarily made for the direct benefit of households within the income

groups found eligible to receive food-allotment coupons. Present standards for the payment, and payments, of social-security and other types of assistance shall not be made less favorable to the recipients or applicants for such assistance, by reason of the operation of the food-allotment plan.

The purpose of this section is clearly to prevent local governments from unloading their own responsibilities onto the Federal Government, and to prevent them from cutting down the allowances they are now making to old-age-assistance recipients or others.

Under section 10 the director is charged with designating appropriate State, local, and private agencies and ration boards to carry out the provisions of the act. Only in case that the director finds upon investigation that appropriate State, local, and private agencies are not available he may establish local offices and employ suitable personnel to receive applications, to determine eligibility, and certify eligibles. Provision for the use of private agencies and for the establishment of federally employed personnel in local offices is made to cover the remote contingency that local or State agencies might not be available in some localities.

It is the expectation, Mr. President, that if this program should be adopted, wherever possible the local ration board would be the agency to certify persons for the supplementary income in the form of food-allotment coupons.

It is not expected that setting up the machinery for the administration of the food-allotment plan would be difficult. The actual work of certifying families would rest almost wholly with local boards. The part which the Federal Government played in the administration of the old stamp plan was neither difficult nor expensive. There is no reason to believe that the administration of the plan contemplated by this amendment would be much more so.

Mr. President, I am covering the ground as fast as I can, because I realize that it is growing late. I want to get through with this bill tonight just as much as does any other Senator. However, I do not want to get through with it until I have had a chance to go on record in regard to this amendment, and secure its adoption, if possible.

The Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration would issue coupons on the certification of the local board. These coupons would be used for the purchase of food only through the normal channels of trade.

The reason for that is that we do not want to provide for setting up Government stores for the distribution of food through this amendment or this food-allotment plan. In the amendment itself it is provided—

The Director shall provide by regulation a simple method for the registration of mercantile establishments selling food and food products at wholesale or retail, which desire to be authorized to receive food-allotment coupons in exchange for food and food products. Such registration shall constitute authority so to receive food-allotment coupons.

In other words, all food purchased with these coupons will be purchased through the normal channels of trade.

The Director is authorized to provide for redemption of food-allotment coupons exchanged for food and food products through the cooperation of the Treasury Department, the General Accounting Office, and banking institutions throughout the Nation. He shall designate banking institutions to accept coupons from sellers of food at retail and wholesale. The amendment provides that banking institutions so serving shall be paid reasonable expenses incurred in such capacity.

Section 203 provides for an educational program as a part of the food-allotment plan. Experience has shown that low-income housewives are, for the most part, anxious to make every penny do as much as possible, and welcome any information which will enable them to improve their buying habits, food utilization techniques, and food-preservation methods.

It is not intended that any new agency shall undertake any additional program, but that the Food Distribution Administration shall cooperate with home demonstration agents and other existing agencies in the program.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, if I may take a short cut to the Senator's argument, would about the same technique be employed under his proposal as was employed under the food-stamp operation before?

Mr. AIKEN. The same technique would be employed, and I have had very extensive consultation with those who administered the old food-stamp plan, and they think they have taken the "bugs" out of it, as faults are called in agency parlance.

Mr. BONE. I know that when that plan was in operation before, it proved to be very popular, at least in my section of the country, and very acceptable. I am much interested in the Senator's argument.

Mr. AIKEN. Some faults were developed in the old food-stamp program. I do not think they ever came to the attention of the public, and we have attempted to remove them by the amendment. However, I dare say some will still remain, and others may develop as time goes on.

Section 302 of the amendment, under the subtitle of "Subsidy Payments Prohibited," has stirred objection on the part of some who might favor the rest of it. Perhaps "controlled" would be a better word than "prohibited." Such a change would be perfectly acceptable to me.

However, if one reads this section through, he will find that the only subsidies prohibited are those which have not been authorized by the Congress. The whole subsidy controversy is based upon a difference in the interpretation of the wording of the Price Control Act.

Certainly, no one believing in Government by the people can argue that executive agencies should be permitted to violate acts of the Congress any more than individual citizens should be per-

mitted to. A Government should have an exemplary standing before its people. It is to be presumed that in the near future Congress will definitely specify the subsidies which it deems to have been authorized.

It is clear that in these days, when a large part of our population has adequate, if not excessive, purchasing power, and the Government is asking for more and more taxes in an effort to avoid inflation and finance expenditures, no one can consistently advocate any form of subsidy which adds appreciably to the already excessive purchasing power of at least half of our citizens.

A direct subsidy to those who really need it will, to a large extent, nullify the arguments of those who insist that all persons should have subsidized food. Not a dollar authorized by this amendment would contribute to inflation, because the people eligible would have no excessive purchasing power under its provisions.

We cannot estimate the value received from this food-allotment plan in terms of dollars and cents alone. By assuring millions of our people enough to eat, we will be insuring many of them against the ravages of disease. We will keep an indeterminate number of them from calling upon their civic governments for relief. We will maintain or improve the efficiency of those who through part-time employment or otherwise are contributing materially to the war effort.

We cannot put a dollar-and-cents value upon the eyesight or the health of children now growing up in these borderline families. The money spent under the provisions of this plan might be returned to our country many times over in dividends of health and efficiency.

Mr. President, I have given a general rather than a technical description of the food-allotment plan which the Senator from Wisconsin and I propose. I reiterate what I stated at the beginning, I know it is not a perfect plan. As I said, we have tried to profit from the experience gained in applying the old stamp plan, and even though our plan is not perfect, I believe it is better than any other plan which has yet been presented for taking care of those who actually need assistance. We have taken care of every member of our own office forces, \$300 or more being given to each, and they have not been humiliated by it. I do not believe those who receive a little help from their Government during this period are going to be more humiliated than they would be by going to local relief authorities and asking for help.

The amendment provides, in section 307, that the provisions of the proposed law and all rules, regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress. It is proposed as a temporary act, but it is my hope that a year's experience with this plan, during which time I surely expect faults to become apparent, will provide us with such further experience and information that we may well make it the basis of a sound

program which in the future will insure to each and every citizen of our Nation a diet which will enable him to maintain his health and efficiency in such a manner that he will be of the fullest value to society.

Mr. President, it has been said, and I read in the newspaper this morning, that the President would surely veto the Bankhead bill. I presume the assertion, which is credited to our revered majority leader, is probably correct, but vetoing the Bankhead bill as now written and vetoing the Bankhead bill with this amendment in it would be two entirely different things. I have many times disagreed with the President. I have certainly not been one of his advisers; I have sometimes suspected his motives, and I believe him to be a very shrewd politician, at least up to this time, but I do not believe he is cruel enough to veto any bill which we send him which provides that 15,000,000 or 18,000,000 people in need and distress in this country shall have enough to eat.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Vermont takes his seat I should like to have it clear in the RECORD that the amendment now proposed and the bill which we joined in introducing are different in that the amendment provides a very much more restricted operation of the plan, both so far as income levels are concerned, and insofar as the assistance which individuals could receive from it are concerned.

I fear that perhaps from some of the Senator's statements with regard to the original bill, which, frankly, we expected the committee to curtail and pare down, the impression might be left that we were now offering as an amendment the full scope of the original bill. Such is not the case, and I wanted that to appear definitely of record, so that Senators would not be under any misapprehension as to what they would be called upon to vote on, especially those Senators who are not present, and who may read the RECORD. In other words, the pending proposal is limited to \$500,000,000, and under a \$500,000,000 program, depending of course on the percentage applying for assistance, and assuming an experience under this plan similar to that we had under the last stamp plan, it would not be possible to extend assistance to families who are receiving incomes in excess of \$1,200.

I wanted that point to be made clear because I think, perhaps, the impression might have been created by the Senator's statement with regard to the original bill that the amendment applied to families with incomes of \$2,350 or less.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct in his statement. The \$500,000,000 limitation probably will not permit any extension of the benefits to families of four, having an income of more than \$1,200 or probably \$1,250 a year. Further than that, before even that assistance could be granted the matter would have to come before the Congress again, be submitted to the Appropriations Committees, and they might cut it down even below that figure, although I should hope they would not, because I think the poor

people of the country need \$500,000,000 worth of help. But if we are to give 15 percent of our people \$500,000,000 in benefits through a general subsidy program, we would have to spend three and a half to four billion dollars to give them the same kind of help we can give them through a food allotment plan for only \$500,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had been hoping that we might finish action on the bill today, but in view of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont it is obvious that we cannot do so. I am anxious that we conclude action on the measure as early tomorrow as possible, and to that end I shall propose a unanimous-consent request. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin desires to address the Senate tomorrow on the amendment for a little longer than the time limit I had in mind. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin be recognized at the beginning of tomorrow's session, and that following his address no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes on the bill, or any amendment or any motion pertaining thereto until final action is taken.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think the agreement will be satisfactory to me, but I have three amendments which I propose to offer, and have printed and lie on the table. Of course, a Senator can take time on the bill and on amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, but a Senator cannot speak on the bill three times. He can take 20 minutes on any of the amendments, and 20 minutes on the bill. Under the agreement the Senator would not be permitted to speak more than once on the bill. I hope the Senator from Florida will not object to the proposal.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall not object, Mr. President.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I share the desire of the leader of the majority that there may be a conclusion reached with respect to this measure, and I express hope that the unanimous-consent request which the Senator has proffered may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at the proper time, before the passage of the pending measure, I intend to move to strike out the subsidies authorized by the so-called Bankhead bill. I am opposed to all subsidies, and intend to move to strike out the favored subsidies authorized and covered by the Bankhead bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the

Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ewell K. Jett, of Maryland, to be a member for the term of 7 years from July 1, 1943.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am personally in favor of the confirmation of this nomination, but there are Members on this side who might want to say something about it. I therefore ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the foreign service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, these are automatic promotions. I ask that the nominations in the foreign service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the foreign-service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs, to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Navy Personnel in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Medical Director Ross T. McIntire, to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Civil Engineer Ben Moreell,

to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 11, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., of Douglaston, N. Y., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Robert E. Hannegan, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Admiral Raymond A. Spruance, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 4th day of February 1944.

Rear Admiral Richmond K. Turner, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 4th day of February 1944.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Annie L. Bell, Slacomb, Ala., in place of Walter A. Blount, transferred.

William Harry Tillery, Vinemont, Ala., in place of Maurice W. Holmes, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

George S. Clarke, Grossmont, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alfred S. Rusconi, San Joaquin, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth P. Wilson, Spring Valley, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

COLORADO

Maggie Jacobsen, Naturita, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edna A. Kennedy, Peetz, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alice J. Reed, Sanford, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Merrill D. Harshman, Wiggins, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

GEORGIA

Melcena Royal, Ambrose, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Floyd L. Crawford, Appling, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Billy S. Hickman, Colbert, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Cleone M. Fincher, Culloden, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

IOWA

Ambrose J. Leinhauser, Agency, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth Longenecker, Aurora, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Earl T. Van Metre, Clemons, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hannah Nelson, Stratford, Iowa, in place of Hilma L. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

KANSAS

Martin A. Basgall, Hays, Kans., in place of Joseph B. Basgall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

KENTUCKY

Mary M. Stahr, Hickman, Ky., in place of Henry L. Amberg, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Charles R. Duplex, Youngsville, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MASSACHUSETTS

Josephine M. Welsh, Sudbury, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elizabeth C. Kelley, Thorndike, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MINNESOTA

Agatha M. Gertken, St. Joseph, Minn., in place of John V. Schroeder, resigned.

MISSOURI

Lloyd Sapp, Ashland, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eugene W. Kurtz, Wyaconda, Mo., in place of Mabel Smulling, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Iona A. Jenness, Rye, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Irene Bruno Amelee, East Williamson, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Beulah Meier, Holtsville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth P. Bailey, Advance, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lawrence G. Garvin, Avondale, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Manning B. Mahafee, Caroleen, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Albert K. Dickens, Castalia, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edelweiss Mishoe, Castle Hayne, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thomas G. Long, East Rockingham, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marguerite M. Wells, Henrietta, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Zora Leah Thomas, Hiddenite, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth B. Hickey, Hiwassee Dam, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Grace Pugh, Hudson, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marion H. Current, Leicester, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Margaret L. Rourke, Leland, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lossie S. Campbell, Lucama, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur Lee Nicholson, Macon, N. C., in place of Lula G. Harris, retired.

Annie F. Briscoe, Mill Spring, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elma B. Harris, Mooresboro, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bessie C. Cox, Newton Grove, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Samuel P. Covington, Pinnacle, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lawrence V. Sigmon, Rosman, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sue C. Worsham, Ruffin, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

McLain L. Furr, Stanfield, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hardee C. Butler, Tuxedo, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Maggie S. Cooley, Wagram, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eva Walker, Walkertown, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH DAKOTA

Noble O. Julson, Plaza, N. Dak., in place of John C. Black, deceased.

OHIO

Ella B. Morgan, Fairpoint, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Neil E. Smith, Noble, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

Elijah E. Meggs, Fort Towson, Okla., in place of Carrie M. Wynn, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Albert R. Hinkle, Clearfield, Pa., in place of Seth W. Bloom, deceased.

Hazle Houseberg, East Bangor, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Amelia Teuchert, Milmont Park, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

A. Blanche McClain, Picture Rocks, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George Ed. Reed, Vanderbilt, Pa., in place of George Ed. Reed, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Curtis W. Younger, Atwood, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katie Potts, Bon Aqua, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Glennie K. Harrison, Cosby, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hollis K. Stephenson, Eagleville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Shafter E. Kidwell, Mohawk, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James T. McCabe, Richard City, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edith D. Hill, Shouns, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Leta McElligott, Bells, Tex., in place of Daniel T. McElligott, deceased.

Andrew R. Davis, Brackettville, Tex., in place of Edith M. Bursey, removed.

John A. Leinweber, Ingram, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sislie Curtis, Larue, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sallye Godbold, Leakey, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lura E. Seale, Lolita, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Wayland B. Weatherred, Pampa, Tex., in place of Curry H. Walker, retired.

Albert W. Mosley, Purdon, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Harleigh A. Somers, Barnet, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VIRGINIA

Jippie S. Yeatts, Hurt, Va. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1943.

WEST VIRGINIA

Jesse C. Garlow, Madsville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Icile O. Anderson, Watson, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John C. Coleman, Wilcoe, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WYOMING

Andrew Lee Johnson, Jackson, Wyo., in place of Robert B. Landfair, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

To be a consul of the United States of America

Leslie W. Johnson

PROMOTIONS

To be Foreign Service officers of class 2, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Don C. Bliss, Jr. Alfred T. Nester
Walter J. Donnelly Albert F. Nufer
William R. Langdon

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Donald F. Bigelow Renwick S. McNiece
David McK. Key Warwick Perkins
Marcel E. Malige J. Bartlett Richards

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

H. Merrell Benninghoff C. Paul Fletcher
Gilson G. Blake Winthrop S. Greene
Joseph F. Burt William M. Gwynn
Reginald S. Castleman Eugene M. Hinkle
Vinton Chapin Clarence E. Macy
Prescott Childs E. Talbot Smith
Charles H. Derry Francis H. Styles

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Sidney A. Belovsky Cloyce K. Huston
Cavendish W. Cannon Perry N. Jester
Augustus S. Chase Kenneth C. Krentz
William P. Cochran, Jr. J. Hall Paxton
Gerald A. Drew Guy W. Ray
Monroe B. Hall Walter N. Walmsley, Jr.
Robert S. Ward

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Walworth Barbour Patrick Mallon
Jacob D. Beam Robert Mills
Barry T. Benson McClintock
Max Waldo Bishop Edward D. McLaughlin
William E. Flournoy, Jr. Troy L. Perkins
Kennett F. Potter
Morris N. Hughes Joseph P. Ragland
Miss Elizabeth Humes John F. Stone
C. Grant Isaacs Tyler Thompson
Robert Janz Joseph I. Touchette
Charles F. Knox, Jr. William C. Trimble
Henry P. Leverich Whitney Young
Raymond P. Ludden
Thomas J. Maleady

To be Foreign Service officers of class 7 of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

John L. Bankhead Andrew G. Lynch
M. Williams Blake Robert B. Memminger
Carl Breuer Charles S. Millet
William F. Busser Bolard More
Thomas S. Campen Brewster H. Morris
David M. Clark Jack B. Neathery
Harry M. Donaldson Miss Katherine E.
Jay Dixon Edwards O'Connor
Perry Ellis John Ordway
James Espy Charles O. Thompson
Richard D. Gatewood S. Roger Tyler, Jr.
John L. Goshie Woodruff Wallner
John D. Jernegan Phillip P. Williams
Hartwell Johnson Robert E. Wilson
Easton T. Kelsey

To be Foreign Service Officers of class 8 of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Roland K. Beyer George D. Henderson
Niles W. Bond John P. Hoover
Robert P. Chalker Donald W. Lamm
Wimberley DeR. Coerr Frederick J. Mann
V. Lansing Collins, Jr. Delano McKelvey
Adrian B. Colquitt Miss Minedee McLean
Thomas J. Cory Julian L. Nugent, Jr.
Edward A. Dow, Jr. Joseph Palmer 2d
Nicholas Feld Richard H. Post
William N. Fraleigh M. Robert Rutherford
John C. Fuess Robert C. Strong
Boles C. Hart, Jr. J. Kittredge Vinson
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr. Alfred T. Wellborn
Charles H. Whitaker

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Medical Director Ross T. McIntire to rank as vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Civil Engineer Ben Moreell to rank as vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

TENNESSEE

George T. Cunningham, Dukedom.
James O. Massey, Finger.
Eugene N. Miller, Vanleer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God be merciful unto us and bless us and cause His face to shine upon us, that Thy way may be known on earth, Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. Let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase; then God, even our own God, shall bless us. God shall bless us and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him.

Our Father, who art in heaven: Hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 10, 1944.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives:

I wish to present my resignation as a member of the House Pensions Committee, to take effect immediately.

Respectfully,

P. W. GRIFFITHS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution

(H. Res. 432), which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Committee on Insular Affairs: LEON H. GAVIN, of Pennsylvania; P. W. GRIFFITHS, of Ohio.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Committee on Enrolled Bills: SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Committee on the Territories: JOSEPH M. PRATT, of Pennsylvania.

Committee on War Claims: JOSEPH M. PRATT, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SOCIALISTIC FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, those who have been fearful that America will be remade along communistic lines will be reassured by yesterday's statement of the Vice President. It is so important that I shall trespass upon the time of the House to read it. Quoting the Vice President:

We are not going to use the whole Russian political and economic system here.

CONDITIONS AT CAMP SHANKS, N. Y.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News, after an investigation of the deplorable conditions existing at Camp Shanks, Orangeburg, Rockland County, N. Y., in my new congressional district, made a number of exceedingly serious charges about a month ago of the corruption, malpractices, and irregularities concerning one of the largest military camps in the Nation. The charges were so shocking in regard to the construction of the camp and the conduct of the military personnel there that the public interest requires immediate action, to turn the searchlight of pitiless investigation upon all those responsible for the prevailing conditions which are a disgrace and an insult to hundreds of thousands of soldiers who have been quartered in this embarkation camp.

I have visited many Army camps, but, have seen none constructed on such a flimsy basis as Camp Shanks. The barracks are unfit for winter use, without a steam-heating system and totally inadequate to afford protection against the winter storms and rain and snow. In justice to our soldiers who use these leaky and wind-blown barracks, while awaiting transportation overseas, there should be no further delay in ascertaining the facts and holding those responsible for the conditions there strictly accountable.

The charges made by the New York Daily News are of such a serious nature

that there should be an immediate investigation by Congress, the War Department, and the Department of Justice to get to the bottom of a disgraceful situation that can only undermine the morale of these soldiers who are quartered there and reflect on the Army officials responsible.

I hope the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], will expedite action through the War Frauds Section of the F. B. I., and that his committee will also take proper steps to have the barracks renovated and to improve the living conditions of the servicemen at at Camp Shanks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Eaton (Ohio) Register-Herald, of January 26, 1944, which quotes from an address by our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPKINS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

FOOD CONDITIONS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, during recent months I have come into the well of the House, each time urging the people to save food, and the people have conserved food. Yet in Philadelphia today, according to headlines in the newspapers, produce rots by the carload. Tons of the food is left on the city dumps, while 427 carloads of fruit and vegetables cannot be unloaded, and 92 carloads of potatoes and fruits are sent to the city dumps. No one to haul them away, they say, while 75 carloads of potatoes, 45,000 pounds to the car, are rotting, blaming it on the high prices—prices quoted are just the same as before the war. For instance, celery retailing at 10 cents per stalk; beets, two bunches for 15 cents; spinach, 2 pounds for 23 cents; lettuce, 12 cents per head. These vegetables retailed at prices higher than this many times during the past 10 years.

Among the items of perishable food were 41 carloads of cabbage, 51 carloads of celery, 35 carloads of carrots, 17 carloads of spinach, and 44 cars of mixed and less popular vegetables.

Things of this kind were unheard of in the days when farm produce flowed through the ordinary channels of trade.

Just a year ago, Philadelphia had a famine in virtually every line of fresh fruit and produce. I am wondering just how soon they will have the next famine. Someone is losing a tremendous lot of money, either the farmers or the shippers, and the consumer also shares in the loss. Think of the cost of the freight alone and the fact that these cars could have been used to haul war materials instead. The Office of Price Administration revealed yesterday that the price of eggs must be reduced from 5 to 9 cents per dozen before the end of the week.

Producers on the Atlantic seaboard are now receiving from 20 to 30 cents per dozen for fresh eggs, while the cost of production is above 40 cents per dozen. The Government is asking to have less pork, less poultry, and fewer eggs produced during 1944. One thing is sure, they are going to get less and at the same time they are promising to supply the whole world with these commodities.

Unless this House supplies sufficient funds for the O. P. A. to carry on they will automatically have to fold up July 1. In the light of their past record and their immediate performance I am wondering what kind of an argument they are going to present to justify the needed appropriation.

INCOME-TAX RETURNS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEISS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS SYSTEMS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on February 3 I made an address and inserted some of my remarks in the RECORD pertaining to Juan Trippe and the Pan American Airlines and included in that speech comments pertaining to the directorships occupied by Mr. Leo T. Crowley. The information that I had was secured from a directory which is utilized by the banks and business people of this Nation, which gives the record of the men on the boards of directors of corporations throughout the United States.

I received a communication from Mr. Crowley under date of February 4, which I feel, in all fairness to him, should be presented to the House. I read it accordingly:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 4, 1944.
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Confirming our telephone conversation of this morning with respect to your speech on the floor of the House yesterday, and so that you may be fully informed of my association with the Lehman Corporation and Pan American Airways System, I was elected to the board of directors of the Lehman Corporation on October 16, 1941. I never attended a directors' meeting, and I resigned from the board December 12, 1941. I was elected a director of the Pan American Airways System in May 1941. I attended one directors' meeting, at which time I indicated my desire to resign. Thereafter I never attended a directors' meeting, and I resigned on August 7, 1943.

I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to submit to you the facts in respect to the foregoing.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LEO CROWLEY.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Cleveland Press relative to the strange problems brought up by the complex tax methods.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN OIL PIPE LINE IN PERSIA

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution asking for a survey of the proposed Ickes Persian pipe line and also a survey of the entire oil petroleum situation as regards this country both at home and abroad. New England has suffered more than any section as the result of the lack of planning regarding petroleum and petroleum products. New York has suffered much, following New England in the extent of its suffering, and the entire east coast also has suffered. I contend that there has been no excuse for that suffering. We should certainly have the entire picture before the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

ALIEN LABOR LEADERS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on tax simplification.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that on Sunday next, at the Press Club in Washington, a memorial ceremony will be held for Raymond Clapper, a man who devoted his entire life to bringing real news from the spot to the reading public and who lost his life

on February 3 in an airplane crash in the Marshall Islands. Mr. Clapper is the sixteenth war correspondent who has lost his life in this war bringing news to the American public from the spot.

On April 9, 1943, I introduced H. R. 2445—to provide for the issuance of a medal in recognition of the services of war correspondents. I again ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to give consideration to the matter of providing a medal for war correspondents who are doing such an admirable job.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record with reference to the coal shortage.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an editorial with reference to the Northeast Airport.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in two instances, in the first to include a letter from an Army private, and in the second instance to include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WAR LABOR BOARD AND UNION MEMBERSHIP RAIDING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, without in any way disagreeing with anything that was stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] about Mr. Smith, the secretary of the M. E. S. A. union, who has called out some 53,000 skilled workers in strikes throughout Ohio and Michigan, there is something else that should be borne in mind. That union is striking because they have been denied an election to determine a bargaining unit and because on these various Government boards and agencies, like the N. L. R. B. and the War Labor Board, the independent unions do not have representatives. The C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. and the employers all have representatives on these various boards, but the independent unions do not have a representative there. So when either the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O. start to

raid a union's membership, the independents are helpless and their union can be destroyed by these boards and the other unions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what about this soldier-vote business that you were in such a hurry about last week?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is reserving the right to object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, worthier hands have taken it over. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves the right to object.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us the legislative program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to do so.

On Monday, District day, I understand there are four or five bills, the numbers of which I do not have readily available, but I understand from the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia the District day calendar might take about an hour.

I shall get the numbers of the bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is not expected that they will be controversial?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding. I will see that the whips on both sides are advised as to the numbers of those bills.

Then a resolution has been reported out of the Rules Committee today, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], House Resolution 346, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate a program for the planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber. I intend to call that up on Monday. Of course, if the bill in relation to the additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior is not disposed of today, I will call that up Monday, after the District of Columbia business is disposed of. In any event, I shall place in order the resolution by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] after the District business and after the Assistant Secretary of the Interior bill is out of the way.

If any matter comes up on Monday where there is a roll call on the passage, I will be glad to have the roll call taken on Tuesday, if that is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then on Tuesday there will be the call of individual bills on the Private Calendar; not the omnibus bills.

I understand the resolution offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] will take only 1 hour. I think it is a fine resolution, and I do not think there is any controversy about it. I know of no opposition, but naturally the Rules Committee had to act on it. Whether the full hour will be taken or not, I do not know, but I do not think there is any controversy in that bill.

Then on Tuesday, H. R. 3209, authorizing construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substitutes to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, 2 hours of general debate have been provided. That will be the next order of business after the Anderson resolution, but not before Tuesday, and after the call of the individual bills on the Private Calendar. I doubt if anything else will be taken up that day.

I am putting down for Wednesday another bill on which a rule was reported out today, H. R. 4103, on which 1 hour of debate is provided. That is a bill to provide for the loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances. It is from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

I am informed that the Committee on Appropriations will report two appropriation bills on Wednesday, one, the civil functions bill, and the other, the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill. Both of those will be reported out. I am informed there is no difficulty or controversy about the civil functions bill. It may not take very long on its passage.

Acting upon that information I have asked that the other bill should be ready to be reported out on Wednesday and it is my understanding that it will be reported. I spoke to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], chairman of that subcommittee and I have spoken to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the subcommittee, handling the civil functions bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania informs me it will not take more than half an hour, or probably an hour to finish that bill. Assuming it requires longer, then the other appropriation bill will come up on Thursday and Friday. I think it is important to get through the appropriations bills as quickly as possible.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is anxious to know, if the conferees should happen to make a report on the soldiers' voting bill, whether a place would be provided for that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, absolutely. I am sure it is understood that any program I announce is always subject to the understanding that when conference reports come in they will be brought up as quickly as possible. Certainly if the conferees should agree on that bill, it will be brought up as quickly as possible after it is reported in.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman can help me a little. Am I right in assuming that the Senate has sent three bills here?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I do not know that I can help the gentleman out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You being the leader, I went to the highest source. I am just coming to you now.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman asks the question seriously.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Surely, about this soldiers' voting bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that there is one completed bill with differences between the two branches; that is in conference. There is another bill that has been passed by the Senate. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can you tell us which one they really want?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman from Michigan is again asking a very serious question and that is a matter for the majority of both branches of the Congress to deal with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am a little disturbed about the program with reference to the appropriation bills, because the program as suggested would bring the reading of the bill right into Washington's Birthday, which I imagine would be a bad time. That is the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments' bill. There is likely to be quite a little excitement over that bill. In view of that fact, I am a little disturbed about the program which brings the reading of the bill right into Washington's birthday. It does not make any difference to me. I have to be here anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose we let the program, as I have announced it, stand for the time being. Of course, the gentleman from New York knows that I like to make the program as nearly as possible satisfactory to all the Members. I suggest that we leave the program stand and then we can discuss that later.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New York that Washington's Birthday does not come next week.

Mr. TABER. But it comes the week after. If these bills are reported out on Wednesday, and general debate disposed of on Thursday and Friday, and perhaps Monday, we would have the reading of the bill on Washington's Birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that the conferees on the soldiers' voting bill have not been selected in the Senate. When they are selected it is our intention to move forward as rapidly as possible.

I think it would be a wholesome thing if it could go over Sunday and Lincoln's Birthday. I almost wish we could move Washington's Birthday up to get it in too.

Then we might have a complete revival of righteousness here and at the other end of the Capitol, and might get them to adopt the constitutional States' rights bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must interpose. Comity between the two bodies has always been zealously guarded by all of us.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I did not violate the rules of the House. I did not refer to a Senator. I said the other body.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was objecting to the adjective the gentleman used.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, a revival of righteousness will not hurt them; nor would it hurt here.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

SAM HARDY

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House is very fortunate in having as its messenger an outstanding character, Sam Hardy, who yesterday completed 36 years of faithful service with this great committee. In honor of the occasion the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] offered the following resolution:

On motion of Mr. COOPER, the Committee on Ways and Means—

Resolved, That the committee go on record, on this thirty-sixth anniversary of Sam Hardy's employment with the committee, expressing its gratitude and appreciation for the loyal, faithful, courteous, and efficient services rendered by him during those years.

Resolved, further, That this resolution be spread on the minutes of the committee and a copy delivered to the said Sam Hardy."

R. L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman.

Attest:

C. MALCOLM HEVENOR, Clerk.

May I not take sufficient time of the House to read Sam Hardy's remarks in reply. They are as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1944.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Ways and Means Committee, on the 9th day of February 1908, I was employed by the Ways and Means Committee as assistant messenger. During my 36 years under the 8 chairmen that I have had the honor of serving, I have witnessed some wonderful experiences. Those chairmen are, namely, the Honorables Serena E. Payne, Oscar W. Underwood, Claude Kitchin, Joseph W. Fordney, William R. Green, James W. Collier, Willis C. Hawley, and Robert L. Doughton. Today, Representative ADOLPH SABATH, of Illinois, is the only Member of the House who was here when I came. I have seen them come and go. I have seen 23 tax bills placed on the statute books, 7 tariff bills, 3 trade agreement bills, and 8 bonus bills, as well as various other pieces of legislation placed on the statute books. I have been with this committee all day, all night, holidays, and Sundays, and am still feeling fine. I have enjoyed the work and found it very interesting. On February 9 I also celebrated my thirty-first wedding anniversary. I want to thank the chairman and

members and appreciate all they have said about me.

Again I thank you,

SAM HARDY.

I might mention in connection with Mr. Hardy's remarks that the committee saw fit to present him with a substantial purse in recognition of the fine, loyal, efficient service he has given to us in the past. I am sure I voice the sentiment of the members of the great Committee on Ways and Means when I say we all hope that Sam Hardy will continue to serve as faithfully, as loyally, and as efficiently in the next 36 years as he has in the period past.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a short quotation from President Woodrow Wilson on the question of soldiers' voting.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDBLUM] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RANK OF CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS OF UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1023) to establish a chief of chaplains of the United States Navy, introduced by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill does?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I intend to offer an amendment to the committee amendment which I will explain at that time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thought the gentleman might explain the bill briefly to the membership now.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. It will establish the office of chief of chaplains in the Navy and provide for the rank of captain as permanent rank and the rank of rear admiral as temporary rank during the period of the war.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This comes with a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes; it does.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That one chaplain on the active list in the Corps of Chaplains of rank not below that of lieutenant commander may be appointed by the President and with the advice and consent of the Senate to be chief of chaplains of the United States Navy.

He shall serve as such for 4 years, and shall have the rank, pay, and allowance of captain while so serving. His duties shall include investigation into the qualifications of candidates for appointment as acting chaplains and chaplains and general coordination and supervision of the work of chaplains: *Provided*, That until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may fix, the chief of chaplains shall be entitled to hold the temporary rank of rear admiral, and shall receive the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half while serving in such grade.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged by proclamation of the President or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may fix, there shall be in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy one officer who shall be entitled to hold the temporary rank of rear admiral, and shall receive the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half while serving in such grade."

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: On page 2, strike out lines 8 to 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That one chaplain on the active list in the Corps of Chaplains of rank not below that of lieutenant commander shall be designated by the Secretary of the Navy to be chief of chaplains of the United States Navy. He shall serve as such for 4 years, and shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of captain while so serving: *Provided*, That until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may fix, the chief of chaplains shall have the temporary rank of rear admiral, and shall receive the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half while serving in such grade."

Amend the committee amendment to the title by striking out "A bill to authorize one officer in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy with the temporary rank of rear admiral." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "A bill to establish a chief of chaplains of the United States Navy."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of having the RECORD definitely and clearly show what this bill does. It is a very fine bill and a similar bill should have been passed long ago. I should like for my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make a short statement so there will be no misunderstanding so far as the RECORD is concerned as to what the bill accomplishes and what it does; and for that purpose I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are at the present time serving in the United States Navy 1,809 chaplains. The authorized strength of the Chaplain Corps is 2,100. During the war the number has increased from 104 to the present strength of 1,809.

The organized religious bodies of the country who have jurisdiction over the passing on applications for chaplains feel

this is a propitious time to accord the same dignity to the Chaplain Corps of the Navy that has been accorded to other corps of the Navy. In the Dental Corps the chief is a rear admiral. This bill, even with my amendment, does not meet entirely the desires and wishes of the organized religious bodies of the country but it is a step in the right direction, inasmuch as it establishes for the first time a chief of chaplains of the United States Navy which heretofore has merely been a courtesy title. The chief of chaplains by this bill is given the permanent rank of captain and during the period of the war the temporary rank of rear admiral with the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman is making a good presentation. I am heartily in accord with the principles of the bill and hope it is speedily adopted. It certainly is most meritorious.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. The Bureau of Personnel of the Navy has approved this step. I want to compliment my good friend from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] for introducing this measure and thank him for the cooperation I have received from him in handling this bill before the committee. I hope the House will agree to it unanimously.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to say to the gentleman that my purpose in moving to strike out the last word was to get him to explain the bill. I appreciate his very fine explanation. I think the bill is a splendid one, for there is no place where the morale of the men in the armed forces is more greatly influenced than the Chaplain's Corps of these forces. Recognizing the Chaplain Corps of the Navy in this manner is bound to have a very stimulating and beneficial effect.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the majority leader for his statement.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman spoke of the fact that there had been some investigation by religious denominations in respect to this act.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes. The organized Protestant denominations, numbering 22, officially recognized by the Navy, the National Catholic Welfare Conference acting for the conference, and the Board of Jewish Rabbis, acting for the Jews, have been consulted, approve and agree to this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it in order to ask for recognition under the 5-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman rises in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I do not. I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman desires recognition?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; to strike out the last word, but not in opposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has an amendment pending to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, then I move to strike out two of them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this bill. All I want to know from the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], who I understand introduced this bill, is something of the history of the legislation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, for a year and a half the religious bodies of this country importuned me to introduce a bill which would provide for that which this day has been accomplished. The religious bodies were not satisfied with the bill as reported by the committee. They said through Dr. S. Arthur Devan, director of the general religious commission, that the bill as reported does not create a chief of chaplains of the United States Navy whose duties shall include investigation into the qualifications of candidates for appointment as acting chaplains and chaplains and general coordination and supervision of the work of the chaplains. It leaves unchanged the administration of matters pertaining to naval chaplains and thereby fails to designate for the supervision of those entrusted with the moral and spiritual welfare of the Navy personnel, a man who by training, experience, and interest in religious work would be specially qualified for such office.

According to Dr. Devan, the original bill constituted a big step toward placing the Navy chaplains on a par, administratively, with the Army Chaplains Corps. The Navy chaplaincy now is a part of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and the original bill would officially make the head of the Navy chaplains a chief of chaplains, nominated by the President and Senate, with a definite term of office and powers under the law.

So in conjunction with my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY], and I am assured with no objection from my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, we worked out an amendment which has been adopted. This bill, if it becomes a law, will satisfy, and I am of the opinion that it will comply with, the requests and the demands and the interests of the religious organizations expressed throughout the country with respect to the contribution which the Navy might well make toward the religious education and the care and comfort of the men in the armed forces represented in the Navy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. I was advised this was a bill introduced by him and only wished to be

sure. He has rendered a worthy service to the clergymen.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to amend the title of the bill. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the amended title that he proposes is exactly like the one in the bill.

Mr. **BRADLEY** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the committee amendment contained an amendment striking out the title.

The committee amendment to amend the title was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **KELLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. **MCCORMACK**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Arnold	Fulmer	McConnell
Barden	Gale	Magnuson
Bell	Gallagher	May
Bennett, Mich.	Gamble	Morrison, La.
Bonner	Gavin	Morrison, N. C.
Buckley	Gifford	Murray, Tenn.
Buffett	Gorski	O'Leary
Burchill, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	Ploeser
Byrne	Hare	Powers
Cannon, Fla.	Harness, Ind.	Price
Carson, Ohio	Hart	Rabaut
Chapman	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, Mo.	Hess	Rowe
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Schiffler
Cullen	Jackson	Schuetz
Curley	Jennings	Schwabe
Davis	Johnson	Scott
Dawson	Anton, J.	Shafer
Dirksen	Jonkman	Short
Domenegeaux	Judd	Smith, Va.
Dondero	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Douglas	King	Stearns, N. H.
Eaton	Kieberg	Stockman
Ellis	Klein	Summers, Tex.
Elmer	LaPollette	Vinson, Ga.
Engel, Mich.	Lanham	Wadsworth
Fay	Lea	Wiley
Feighan	Luce	Winter
Fuller	Lynch	

The **SPEAKER**. On this call 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, the Chair designates the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. **ANDERSON**] to read Washington's Farewell Address, Tuesday, February 22, 1944.

There was no objection.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. **LUDLOW**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4133) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4133, with Mr. **CLARK** in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For the Chief of the Division and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$85,000.

Mr. **CANNON** of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the **CONGRESSIONAL RECORD** is, at best, rather dry reading. And it probably receives less attention from the average reader in proportion to its importance than any other publication of the day. That is particularly true of that part of the **RECORD** reporting the debates on the annual appropriation bills. They deal with statistics. They are largely concerned with technical and financial matters and have little reader appeal. But I am going to ask the Members of the House to make an exception and read in detail yesterday's debate on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill as reported in this morning's **RECORD**. You will find it of more than ordinary interest—and it is of more than passing importance, because the amendments offered yesterday are typical of the amendments which will be offered to all the supply bills for the remainder of the session. Regardless of the amounts carried in the general appropriation bills this session—whether high or low, whether adequate or inadequate, however reasonable and however well justified—amendments to cut the appropriations in comparatively small amounts will be offered and the time of the House will be taken up in specious debate in support of them as on yesterday.

The reason is obvious. Our system of government is the most perfect form of government yet devised by the mind of man. But no product of the human brain is perfect. And one inevitable and unavoidable concomitant of our democratic system of government is the necessity of submitting to the electorate every 2 years political issues on which to base campaigns for the biannual elections. If there are no particularly pertinent issues, they must be developed, and magnified and emphasized. The supply bills, although essentially nonpolitical, offer exceptional opportunities for the incubation of such issues. And for 6 or 8 months preceding the national campaign the thousands of items in the annual appropriation bills are vehicles for the never-failing and ever-popular amendments to cut expenditure.

But no one need be misled. You can always recognize the hack political amendment. It cannot be disguised; it cannot be camouflaged; no amount of smoke screen however adroitly maneuvered can conceal it.

A political amendment can always be identified by two indelible earmarks. In the first place, whenever a member of the committee reporting the bill submits here on the floor an amendment which has not been submitted or suggested in the hearings, in the subcommittee or the committee—which has never been offered at any stage of the long consideration which precedes the report to the House—that amendment is a political amendment, offered for political purposes, and there is no possibility of any other construction.

In the second place, when a vote is taken here in the House on—

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. **CANNON** of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. **H. CARLANDERSEN**. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether or not he intends to consume the additional 5 minutes in making a political speech instead of talking on the bill.

Mr. **CANNON** of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will leave that to the Congress and the country to decide.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CANNON** of Missouri. There is a further method by which you can determine beyond the peradventure of a doubt whether an amendment is a political amendment. Whenever on a standing vote, every Member on one side of the House rises in support of an amendment and every Member on the other side rises in opposition, its identity as a political amendment is indubitably fixed. On all questions coming before the House in which a real issue is involved, the House divides—not along political lines—but according to geographical, economic, industrial, or sectional interests. On all such questions, Members from both parties will be found voting for and against. It is only on patently partisan questions that the House unanimously divides on party lines. That was the situation yesterday when we voted on the several amendments offered to the Treasury and Post Office bill by members of the subcommittee which drafted it.

There was a single exception. When we voted on one of the amendments a lone Democrat rose on this side of the aisle to vote with our Republican brethren standing solidly on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. **THOMAS** of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. **THOMAS** of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. **THOMAS** of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. **CANNON** of Missouri. In just 1 minute, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Your 5 minutes will be up in about 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust I can have time enough to answer the gentleman.

Here was a Member who had not read the bill; who has not heard the amendment; who had had no opportunity to listen to the debate. All he knew was that the vote was on a motion to cut. It is easy to understand that kind of political philosophy. A vote to cut appropriations is an easy vote to defend before an uninformed audience. The boast that a Member has voted to cut expenditures at every opportunity offered during his service in the House will meet with applause from an unthinking electorate. But it is the mark of utter incompetence. There are times when reduction of expenditures is highly desirable. And there are times when a vote to cut an item in an appropriation bill is just as highly reprehensible. There are items in these annual supply bills on which a vote to reduce is a vote to cripple an essential activity. And in a majority of instances, in the consideration of such a bill as this a Member of the House can render no greater disservice to the country than by voting to cut items of appropriation.

That is particularly true of the pending measure. It is perhaps the most important of the annual appropriation bills. It deals with national finance. It has a tremendous responsibility in providing funds to carry on the war. The collection of taxes, the sale and servicing of the War bonds, the accounting in connection with \$100,000,000,000 a year of expenditures is the largest fiscal task ever undertaken by the treasury department of any government in the history of the world. This bill, as it came from the committee, is a carefully considered and a meticulously prepared measure. It has been cut and trimmed by the committee after exhaustive hearings and in the light of investigations by specially trained accountants and inspectors. To increase or reduce the carefully estimated figures in any item of the bill is to throw it out of adjustment. And yet Members here are willing to take that risk and divide on party lines on matters of such ominous responsibility in times like these.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the gentleman from Missouri is talking on a political matter and the gentleman, therefore, is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, let me again earnestly urge the Members of the House to read carefully the proceedings and debate on this bill

as reported in this morning's RECORD. The bill has been prepared by the ablest and most experienced Members of the House, men who have served on this committee and this subcommittee for many years. It is the most carefully drawn and painstakingly prepared bill, in my opinion, ever reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The debate yesterday by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] indicate a comprehensive knowledge of the bill and evinces the highest order of constructive statesmanship. I suggest that Members clip these pages from the RECORD and file them for ready reference.

Mr. Chairman, no one can charge this committee with countenancing unwarranted expenditures. On all nonwar appropriations we have cut to the irreducible minimum. It is to be noted that this committee in the last 2 years has reduced expenditures by a greater percentage than in any like period in the fiscal history of the Nation.

And I have no protest to make against the submission of political amendments. I am not complaining on that score. I am not objecting. I am not criticizing. Politics is the order of the day. We practice it on both sides of the aisle—on this side as well as on that side. But I am calling attention to the obvious character of the amendments offered to this bill yesterday and to the fact that we may expect on all the supply bills for the remainder of the session similar amendments and the attempt to develop similar spurious issues. The House should take note of it, and the country should be apprised of it. It will explain many things which the unsuspecting layman sees in the papers and hears from time to time over the air. We have cut the appropriations. We have cut drastically. But we refuse to cut the jugular vein.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I again make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order. He is making a political speech. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman is a distinguished parliamentarian. I want to ask him this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute in order to yield to my friend from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I want to propound this question to the gentleman. In view of the fact that the gentleman is probably one of the most distinguished parliamentarians in the House, does he mean to say that every time an amendment is presented here, which has not been presented to the subcommittee, or presented to the main committee, it is a political amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly not; but I do say this, that when an amendment of this character is presented on the floor by members of the

subcommittee reporting the bill who have gone through the hearings, have been afforded every opportunity to offer amendments and suggestions both in the subcommittee and the main committee, and have never before suggested such amendments, and then when they are presented here on the floor we divide on purely political lines, there is no escaping the conviction that it is a political amendment, offered for purely political purposes. There can be no other conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the leader of unlicensed governmental spending has spoken. For 10 long years I have been trying to prevent the wild spending of the people's money on bills that have been brought in here and that have been supported by the Roosevelt administration.

Yesterday it was my privilege to offer seven or eight amendments to this bill. When the bill was in the committee I announced that I would be bound by no agreement as to any item; that I reserved the right to offer amendments to bring the bill in line with the testimony and the reports of the investigators of the Committee on Appropriations. I have offered some of those amendments. Not once has there been an intelligent, analyzable answer to the statements that I made yesterday in support of those amendments. Irrelevant statements were made, but not a direct, positive answer which was intelligible and which would hold water.

Yes, it is true that that action of the committee yesterday was a division, insofar as the membership voting on partisan lines was concerned.

I have never been so surprised in my life as I have been these last 2 days at the tight, close, keen, discipline under which the majority Members in this House have been held. One Member from Arkansas, yes, did go through with us once, but he did not go through again, and no other Member of the majority went through again notwithstanding that continuously and repeatedly no justifiable argument was made against the amendments I offered to cut items.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment. Let me say that if it is a political issue, economy and honesty and efficiency and putting the bureaucrats in order, it is a good political issue and on that I am ready to go to the public.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. I just wondered how many on the other side voted against some of the amendments.

Mr. TABER. Oh, I do not know any.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is what I thought.

Mr. TABER. But I do not believe that on a roll call the Members on the majority side would want to vote to support the position the committee took in favor of the increased expenditures.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would like to say to the gentleman that one reason many of us, if not most of us, vote for his amendments is because we trust the gentleman from New York. We think he studies these amendments. We are all anxious to grasp at any straw to cut expenses, and we know that the gentleman from experience tries to lead us along the right path toward economy.

Mr. TABER. I am going to give one illustration of the type of amendments that were offered. I could go into every one just as thoroughly.

In the Office of Customs there were 437 vacancies in the field as against a proposed employment of 8,400, and that included the vacancy set-up; there were 31 vacancies in the Department. They did not expect to fill any of those vacancies. The committee cut \$500,000. The total salaries of that group of vacancies figured \$1,450,000, and I offered to cut only another \$500,000. If I was wrong, the wrong consisted in not adding another \$450,000 to the proposed cut; I was not wrong because I asked for too great a cut.

Never in my long service here in this House have I seen such an attempt to becloud the issue as that which was made by my friend the gentleman from Missouri. He would like to have it go out to the country that one votes to save a dollar only for political effect. If that kind of statement is to be the excuse of the spenders, God help the country if they follow that kind of reasoning.

I appeal to the membership of this House. We are up against a serious proposition in this country with an ever-mounting debt, with tremendous appropriation bills before us. The first bill we had called for \$11,450,000,000; the second, the one now under consideration, carries directly and indirectly \$11,985,000,000. Are not these figures of sufficient moment that they call for the earnest and devoted consideration of the membership of this House? If it is a political issue, if the gauntlet is down I accept it. I stand for the taxpayers and the people of the United States, and I hope the House of Representatives will stand for the people of the United States and not for profligate spending.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I would regret very deeply if anything were said on this floor that would reflect on the high character and fine service rendered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I have been here for 10 years sitting with the gentleman from New York on this and other committees. I know he is deeply and conscientiously interested in the welfare of this country, in economy, and in doing a fine job; and I would not want anyone to think that our committee feels for 1 minute that

the gentleman from New York is not of the highest type.

Let us just be frank with each other. The gentleman from New York is also human. He has responsibilities here as a member of his own party. No man here is so guileless as not to recognize that we are all elected by parties and have party responsibilities. The facts in this case are very simple. In the past we have sat as appropriation subcommittees through long hearings. We talked things over usually in a very friendly way and agreed and then we came on the floor and stood by the action of the committee. Even when we are criticized when others want to cut down the appropriation we have stood together on both sides of the aisle. I do not know whether it is a coincidence or not that the situation is different in this year 1944. We had amicable sessions on this bill. The gentleman from New York was just as agreeable as he could be, as in the past, and we were all agreeable. Much to my surprise and to the surprise of the subcommittee, when we came on the floor certain items which we had discussed and agreed upon in the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York proposed to cut further by amendments offered here on the floor. In the past our experience has been that when we agreed on items in committee we practically stood by them.

The gentleman from New York will have to answer to his own conscience at least as to why there seems to be, at least to the committee on this side of the aisle, a little change of attitude in 1944. Common sense and experience can interpret why the gentleman offers on the floor amendments to cut further the amounts agreed upon.

The gentleman is not only an excellent Member of Congress but he is a fine Republican. I am not criticizing him for anything that he may do that he thinks may be advantageous to his party. I should like to say just this one thing further: When the gentleman from New York made the first speech on this bill he stated it carried \$12,000,000,000. The total cuts proposed by the gentleman from New York up to the present time amount to one ten-thousandth—that is all he has proposed—one ten-thousandth of the total amount of this bill, one one-hundredth of 1 percent. That is what has happened here. The total of all cuts proposed by the gentleman from New York is one one-hundredth of 1 percent or one ten-thousandth of the total carried in this bill. It seems to me that possibly the effect of these cuts is being overemphasized, the effect they may have on the whole world economy and the economy of this country.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman tell the House how much this bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations was below the Budget estimate?

Mr. O'NEAL. I would have to refer to the figures. They are in our report.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is below the Budget estimate?

Mr. O'NEAL. I think it was \$13,000,000 for the Postal Department and—

Mr. COCHRAN. That \$13,000,000 was not cut by the Republicans, it was cut by the Democrats and the Republicans, the entire committee? The gentleman from Indiana says it was cut \$23,000,000 below the Budget estimate. Therefore those of us who support the committee vote for a saving of \$23,000,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. That would seem to be an agreeable report to both sides of the aisle.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. It was cut some \$23,000,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. The total cut. And of the amount which we are appropriating here, there are many millions that are not subject to any cut whatsoever.

Mr. LUDLOW. There are 116 items in the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. In the permanent appropriation there is the sinking fund refunds and such items which are fixed and cannot be pared.

Mr. LUDLOW. Here are the appropriations that should not be touched at all. There is one here of \$405,170,000. For permanent appropriations there are \$5,300,000,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. Something over \$5,000,000,000 is subject to possible reduction by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall be used during the fiscal year 1945 for the purchase, within the continental limits of the United States, of any standard typewriting machines (except bookkeeping, billing, and electric machines) at a price in excess of the following for models with carriages which will accommodate paper of the following widths to wit: Ten inches (correspondence models), \$70; 12 inches, \$75; 14 inches, \$77.50; 16 inches, \$82.50; 18 inches, \$87.50; 20 inches, \$94; 22 inches, \$95; 24 inches, \$97.50; 26 inches, \$103.50; 28 inches, \$104; 30 inches, \$105; 32 inches, \$107.50; or, for standard typewriting machines distinctively quiet in operation, the maximum prices shall be as follows for models with carriages which will accommodate paper of the following widths, to wit: Ten inches, \$80; 12 inches, \$85; 14 inches, \$90; 18 inches, \$95.

Mr. TABER. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Procurement Division I am not going to offer an amendment to cut this, but there is a situation there that I feel should be called to the attention of the House and the country, and a tremendously serious situation, too. The Army, the Navy, the War Food Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Lease-Lend set-up, and all sorts of units of the Government are developing surplus property. It is not being handled properly or efficiently; it is not being handled so that the goods that are created as surplus property either get quickly into other

Government agencies where they may be used or back into the regular channels of trade. On the other hand, they are getting into the hands of brokers who bid them in at quick sales and the whole thing is not handled in the interest of the Government and the Government's interests are not protected. We are not following up our stock piles and keeping them clean as we should.

In the New York Herald Tribune this morning there is a write-up concerning 216,000 pounds of butter that have deteriorated to such an extent that it is no longer fit for table use. It is being dumped into cooking channels.

My understanding is that in the lease-lend set-up the War Food Administration and other agencies have some 20,000,000 pounds nearly in the same shape. That butter, according to the information that I receive from people who understand the business, should be placed where it can be of use to the civilian population and where it may be salvaged before it gets to the point where it has to be used for something other than that for which it was made.

It does not do any good to pile up those kind of surpluses and let them spoil. And, on the other hand, it places a burden on our civilian population which is not justified.

I hold in my hand a photographic reproduction of an advertisement taken from the New York Journal of Commerce of date January 11, 1944, by the Surplus & Salvage Sales Co., Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., which indicates that they have currently for sale a lot of dehydrated pea soup, 25,000 gallons, 1943 crop orange juice, and 75,100 bags No. 3 Indiana pea beans, no priorities, no points.

Instead of that material being in the hands of some salvage outfit, it ought to be handled in such a way that it gets into the usual channels of trade and so that the people of the country may have it to eat.

There is also a further advertisement by the same organization advertising billions in merchandise, machinery, textiles, food, and plants to be liquidated after the war. It states:

Millions in merchandise available now. Vast potentialities make it imperative that I meet with principals who have knowledge of merchandising and are financially responsible. For the last 6 months we have been ascertaining possibilities, and are now ready and qualified to meet with proper associates for the establishment of New York offices.

That is an advertisement by the same salvage company.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that there are some funds carried in the pending bill for the handling of transferred property by the Procurement Division. I call attention also to the fact that these people undoubtedly are not equipped with the kind of legislation they ought to have or the kind of people they ought to have to handle the situation. It is crying out loud for immediate attention.

There is a bill pending before the Banking and Currency Committee and I am in hopes that the House of Repre-

sentatives, through its proper committee, will take some action that will get these goods back into the regular channels of trade and put an end to these peculiar operations by certain salvage sales companies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, relative to what the gentleman has just said about the bill pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency (H. R. 3873) providing for a central agency to dispose of surplus war material, may I state to the gentleman for his information that we have had hearings lasting over 1 week, almost 2 weeks, on that particular bill. The committee, as its chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] announced yesterday, will resume hearings again next Monday. Mr. Jesse Jones will be the first witness next Monday.

I am in hearty accord with what I heard the gentleman say—I did not hear all of his speech but I heard part of it—to the effect that he is in favor of those goods going through the normal channels of trade and distribution. We have some minor scandals in the country now by reason of the way these surplus goods are being disposed of, and we shall have some major ones if it is not stopped. It should be stopped. There should be one central agency.

Our committee, the House Committee on Small Business, disclosed that in one section of the United States procurement agencies would be disposing of the same kind of materials at a very low price, in fact, a give-away price, whereas on the other side of the United States they would be buying new the same kind of materials. That just does not make sense and should be stopped. We should have a bill enacted into law at an early date which will cause this vast store of surplus war materials to be disposed of through the normal channels of trade and distribution.

Many people do not realize how much these goods will amount to. It is our prediction, based upon the amount we had during the last war, that when this war is over, if over within the next 12 months—if it is longer the amount will increase—we shall have between fifty and seventy-five billion dollars worth of plants, machinery, materials, goods, and supplies of all kinds, types, and characters.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. When the gentleman estimates there will be fifty to seventy-five billion dollars worth of goods to be disposed of, does the gentleman include in that the 20,000,000 acres of land which have been taken over?

Mr. PATMAN. Without agreeing as to the amount, for I am not acquainted with the exact amount of acreage, I may say it is included. In the case of defense plants, of course, the real estate is included.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman includes land also?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman heard our colleague from New York say something about 216,000 pounds of butter that had spoiled in New York and would have to be sold on the market as cooking butter. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. PATMAN. No; but I would not be surprised at it.

Mr. STEFAN. How is that to be disposed of?

Mr. PATMAN. In any huge program things like that will happen. They will happen to any big corporation, and they will happen to the Government, too.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman does not have any details on that?

Mr. PATMAN. No; in fact, I am not surprised at things like that happening. In a program as large as this you naturally expect some things like that to happen.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman's committee written a bill the objective of which is to have one organization?

Mr. PATMAN. One central agency.

Mr. STEFAN. Have you introduced a bill to that effect?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. It is H. R. 3873. It is the House Committee on Small Business bill. All the members of this committee helped to formulate it. I introduced it as chairman.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the status of it?

Mr. PATMAN. The status of it is that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], announced yesterday that we would resume hearings commencing next Monday, and Mr. Jesse Jones, the Federal Loan Agency Administrator, will be the first witness.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman's bill make any provision for the final sale and disposition of real property which has been acquired by the Government in the expanded war program?

Mr. PATMAN. I think the bill would include it, but it is my opinion that the committee is going to leave that out. I do not think we will deal or attempt to deal in this particular bill with that at this time.

Mr. COOLEY. It deals only with personal property and not real estate?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is what is contemplated in this particular bill right now.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think it would be well for the committee to give some consideration to the method of disposing of these large areas of land which have been acquired in camps and cantonments throughout the country?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; the only reason we are inclined to put that aside for the present is that this other is urgent. There is more of a necessity for immediate attention being paid to the movable materials than there is to the real property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4133) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am as it is at present.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments:

"Reduce Bureau of Customs \$500,000, making the amount carried \$25,000,000.

"Reduce Treasurer's Office \$175,000, making the amount carried, \$3,900,000.

"Reduce Bureau of Engraving and Printing \$350,000, making the amount carried, \$9,650,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 52, noes 75.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. This is an automatic call. The Doorkeeper will close the doors and the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 162, nays 164, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—162

Allen, Ill.	Angell	Beall
Andersen,	Arends	Bender
H. Carl	Arnold	Bennett, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bishop
Andresen,	Barrett	Blackney
August H.	Bates, Mass.	Bolton

Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Mundt	Ward
Brehm	Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.	Wasielewski
Brown, Ohio	Hoever	Norman	Weaver
Brumbaugh	Hoffman	O'Brien, N. Y.	Weiss
Busbey	Holmes, Mass.	O'Hara	Wene
Butler	Holmes, Wash.	O'Konski	
Canfield	Hope	Phillips	
Carlson, Kans.	Horan	Pittenger	
Carrier	Howell	Poulson	
Carson, Ohio	Hull	Powers	
Case	Jeffrey	Pracht,	
Chenoweth	Jenkins	C. Frederick	
Chiperfield	Jensen	Joseph M.	
Church	Johnson	Ramey	
Clason	Anton J.	Reed, Ill.	
Clevenger	Johnson,	Reed, N. Y.	
Compton	Calvin D.	Rees, Kans.	
Crawford	Johnson, Ind.	Rizley	
Cunningham	Johnson,	Robison, Ky.	
Curtis	J. Leroy	Rockwell	
Day	Johnson, Ward	Rogers, Pa.	
Dewey	Jones	Rogers, Mass.	
Dworshak	Kearney	Rohrbough	
Ellison, Md.	Kilburn	Sauthoff	
Elmer	Klinzer	Scrivner	
Eston, Ohio	Kunkel	Simpson, Ill.	
Fellows	Lambertson	Simpson, Pa.	
Fish	Landis	Smith, Maine	
Gathings	Gavin	Smith, Ohio	
Gearhart	LeCompte	Springer	
Gerlach	LeFevre	Stanley	
Gilchrist	Lemke	Stefan	
Gillette	Lewis	Stevenson	
Gillie	McConnell	Sumner, Ill.	
Goodwin	McCowan	Taber	
Graham	McGregor	Talbot	
Griffiths	McLean	Talle	
Gross	McWilliams	Taylor	
Gwynne	Maas	Thomas, N. J.	
Hagen	Martin, Iowa	Tibbott	
Hale	Martin, Mass.	Towe	
Hall,	Mason	Troutman	
Edwin Arthur	Morrow	Vorys, Ohio	
Hall,	Michener	Vursell	
Leonard W.	Miller, Conn.	Weichel, Ohio	
Halleck	Miller, Mo.	Weich	
Hancock	Miller, Nebr.	Wigglesworth	
Harness, Ind.	Miller, Pa.	Wilson	
Heldinger	Monkiewicz	Wolcott	
Herter	Mott	Woodruff, Mich.	
	Mruk		

NAYS—164

Abernethy	Ford	Monroney
Allen, La.	Fulbright	Murdock
Anderson,	Gibson	Murphy
N. Mex.	Gordon	Myers
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Newsome
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Norrell
Beckworth	Granger	Norton
Bland	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bloom	Green	O'Connor
Boren	Gregory	O'Neal
Boykin	Harless, Ariz.	O'Toole
Brooks	Harris, Ark.	Outland
Brown, Ga.	Harris, Va.	Patman
Bryson	Hart	Patton
Bulwinkle	Hays	Peterson, Fla.
Burch, Va.	Heffernan	Peterson, Ga.
Burgin	Hendricks	Philbin
Camp	Hoch	Poage
Cannon, Fla.	Hollfield	Priest
Cannon, Mo.	Izac	Ramspeck
Capozzoli	Jarman	Randolph
Celler	Johnson,	Rankin
Clark	Luther A.	Robertson
Cochran	Johnson,	Robinson, Utah
Colmer	Lyndon B.	Rogers, Calif.
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Rowan
Cooper	Kee	Russell
Costello	Kefauver	Sabath
Cox	Kelley	Sadowski
Cravens	Kerr	Sasser
Crosser	Kilday	Satterfield
D'Alesandro	King	Scanlon
Delaney	Kirwan	Sheppard
Dickstein	Kleberg	Sheridan
Dies	Lane	Sikes
Dilweg	Larcade	Slaughter
Dingell	Lesinski	Smith, W. Va.
Disney	Ludlow	Snyder
Doughton	McCord	Somers, N. Y.
Drewry	McCormack	Sparkman
Durham	McGehee	Spence
Eberhart	McKenzie	Starnes, Ala.
Elliott	Madden	Stewart
Engle, Calif.	Mahon	Sullivan
Fernandez	Maloney	Tarver
Fisher	Manasco	Thomas, Tex.
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield,	Thomason
Flannagan	Mont	Tolan
Fogarty	Mansfield, Tex.	Vincent, Ky.
Folger	Marcantonio	Voorhis, Calif.
Forand	Mills	Walter

West	Wickersham
Wheelchel, Ga.	Winstead
White	Worley
Whitten	Wright
Whittington	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—103

Andrews	Fulmer	O'Brien, Mich.
Auchincloss	Furlong	O'Leary
Barden	Gale	Pace
Barry	Gallagher	Pfeifer
Bell	Gamble	Ploeser
Bennett, Mich.	Gifford	Plumley
Bonner	Gorski	Price
Bradley, Pa.	Grant, Ind.	Rabaut
Buckley	Hare	Reece, Tenn.
Buffett	Hartley	Richards
Burchill, N. Y.	Hébert	Rivers
Burdick	Hess	Rolph
Byrne	Hobbs	Rowe
Carter	Jackson	Schiffler
Chapman	Jennings	Schuetz
Coffee	Jonkman	Schwabe
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Scott
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Shafer
Courtney	Kennedy	Short
Cullen	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Curley	Klein	Smith, Wis.
Davis	Knutsen	Stearns, N. H.
Dawson	LaFollette	Stockman
Dirksen	Lanham	Summers, Tex.
Domengeaux	Lea	Sundstrom
Dondero	Luce	Treadway
Douglas	Lynch	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	McMillan	Wadsworth
Ellis	McMurray	Willey
Ellsworth	Magnuson	Winter
Engel, Mich.	May	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fay	Merritt	Wolverton, N. J.
Feighan	Morrison, La.	Woodrum, Va.
Fuller	Morrison, N. C.	
	Murray, Tenn.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Curley against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. Cole of Missouri for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. McMurray against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. O'Leary against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Byrne against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Furlong against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Andrews for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Burchill against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Price with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jonkman.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. May with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Schiffler.
 Mr. Gorski with Mr. Ellis.
 Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stockman.
 Mr. Lea with Mr. Shafer.
 Mr. Coffee with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Davis with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Hare with Mr. Knutson.
 Mr. Pace with Mr. Rolph.
 Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Rowe.
 Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Courtney with Mr. Winter.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct an error: That on page 36, line 15, the words "seventy-five" be changed to "ninety-five."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 321, nays 6, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—321

Abernethy	Cleveland	Grant, Ala.
Allen, Ill.	Cochran	Green
Allen, La.	Coffe	Gregory
Andersen,	Colmer	Griffiths
H. Carl	Compton	Gross
Anderson, Calif.	Cooley	Gwynne
Anderson,	Cooper	Hagen
N. Mex.	Costello	Hale
Andresen,	Cox	Hall,
August H.	Cravens	Edwin Arthur
Angell	Crawford	Hall,
Arends	Crosser	Leonard W.
Arnold	Cunningham	Halleck
Baldwin, Md.	Curtis	Hancock
Baldwin, N. Y.	D'Alesandro	Harless, Ariz.
Barrett	Day	Harness, Ind.
Bates, Ky.	Delaney	Harris, Ark.
Bates, Mass.	Dickstein	Harris, Va.
Beall	Dies	Mart
Beckworth	Dilweg	Hartley
Bender	Dingell	Hays
Bennett, Mo.	Disney	Heffernan
Bishop	Drewry	Heldinger
Blackney	Durham	Hendricks
Bland	Dworshak	Hertner
Bolton	Eberharter	Hill
Boren	Elliot	Hinshaw
Boykin	Ellison, Md.	Hoch
Bradley, Mich.	Elmer	Hoeven
Brehm	Elston, Ohio	Hoffman
Brooks	Fellows	Holifield
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	Holmes, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Fish	Holmes, Wash.
Brumbaugh	Fisher	Hope
Bryson	Fitzpatrick	Horan
Bulwinkle	Flannagan	Howell
Burch, Va.	Fogarty	Hull
Burdick	Folger	Izac
Burgin	Forand	Jarman
Busbey	Ford	Jeffrey
Butler	Fulbright	Jenkins
Camp	Gathings	Jensen
Canfield	Gavin	Johnson,
Cannon, Fla.	Gearhart	Anton J.
Cannon, Mo.	Gerlach	Johnson,
Capozzoli	Gibson	Calvin D.
Carlson, Kans.	Gilchrist	Johnson, Ind.
Carrier	Gillette	Johnson,
Carson, Ohio	Gillie	Luther A.
Celler	Goodwin	Johnson,
Chenoweth	Gordon	Lyndon B.
Chiperfield	Gore	Johnson, Ward
Church	Gossett	Jones
Clark	Graham	Kearney
Clason	Granger	Kee

Kefauver	Newsome	Simpson, Ill.
Kelley	Norman	Simpson, Pa.
Kerr	Norrell	Slaughter
Kilday	Norton	Smith, Maine
King	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Kinzer	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, W. Va.
Kirwan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Snyder
Kleberg	O'Connor	Somers, N. Y.
Kunkel	O'Hara	Sparkman
Lambertson	O'Neal	Spence
Landis	O'Toole	Springer
Lane	Outland	Stanley
Larcade	Pace	Starnes, Ala.
LeCompte	Patman	Stefan
LeFevre	Patton	Stevenson
Lemke	Peterson, Fla.	Stewart
Lesinski	Philbin	Sullivan
Lewis	Pittenger	Sumner, Ill.
Ludlow	Plumley	Talbot
McConnell	Poage	Talle
McCord	Powers	Tarver
McCormack	Pracht,	Taylor
McCowan	C. Frederick	Thomas, Tex.
McGehee	Pratt,	Thomason
McGregor	Joseph M.	Tibbott
McKenzie	Priest	Tolan
McLean	Ramey	Towe
McMillan	Ramspeck	Troutman
McWilliams	Randolph	Vincent, Ky.
Maas	Rankin	Voorhis, Calif.
Madden	Reed, Ill.	Vorys, Ohio
Mahon	Reed, N. Y.	Vursell
Maloney	Rees, Kans.	Walter
Manasco	Richards	Ward
Mansfield,	Rivers	Wasielewski
Mont.	Rizley	Weaver
Mansfield, Tex.	Robertson	Weichel, Ohio
Marcantonio	Robinson, Utah	Weiss
Martin, Iowa	Robson, Ky.	Welch
Martin, Mass.	Rockwell	Wene
Mason	Rodgers, Pa.	West
Merrrow	Rogers, Calif.	Whelchel, Ga.
Michener	Rogers, Mass.	White
Miller, Conn.	Rohrbough	Whitten
Miller, Mo.	Rolph	Whittington
Miller, Nebr.	Rowan	Wickersham
Miller, Pa.	Russell	Wigglesworth
Mills	Sabath	Winstead
Monkiewicz	Sadowski	Wolcott
Monroney	Sasser	Wolverton, N. J.
Mott	Satterfield	Woodruff, Mich.
Mruk	Sauthoff	Worley
Mundt	Scanlon	Wright
Murdock	Scrivner	Zimmerman
Murphy	Sheppard	
Murray, Wis.	Sheridan	
Myers	Sikes	

NAYS—6

Case	Kilburn	Taber
Kean	O'Konski	Thomas, N. J.

NOT VOTING—102

Andrews	Fenton	Morrison, La.
Auchincloss	Fuller	Morrison, N. C.
Barden	Fulmer	Murray, Tenn.
Barry	Furlong	O'Leary
Bell	Gale	Peterson, Ga.
Bennett, Mich.	Gallagher	Pfeifer
Bloom	Gamble	Phillips
Bonner	Gifford	Ploeser
Bradley, Pa.	Gorski	Poulson
Buckley	Grant, Ind.	Price
Buffett	Hare	Rabaut
Burchill, N. Y.	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Byrne	Hess	Rowe
Carter	Hobbs	Schiffler
Chapman	Jackson	Schuetz
Cole, Mo.	Jennings	Schwabe
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson,	Scott
Courtney	J. Leroy	Shafer
Cullen	Johnson, Okla.	Short
Curley	Jonkman	Smith, Va.
Davis	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Dawson	Keefe	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Kennedy	Stockman
Dirksen	Keogh	Sumners, Tex.
Domengeaux	Klein	Sundstrom
Dondero	Knutson	Treadway
Doughton	LaFollette	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	Lanham	Wadsworth
Eaton	Lea	Willey
Ellis	Luce	Wilton
Ellsworth	Lynch	Winter
Engel, Mich.	McMurray	Wolfenden, Pa.
Engle, Calif.	Magnuson	Woodrum, Va.
Fay	May	
Feighan	Merritt	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
 Mr. Curley with Mr. Auchincloss.
 Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Dondero.
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Ellis.
 Mr. Barry with Mr. Cole of Missouri.
 Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Judd.
 Mr. Cullen with Mr. LaFollette.
 Mr. McMurray with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Furlong with Mr. Hess.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fenton.
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. Gamble.
 Mr. Fay with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
 Mr. Byrne with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
 Mr. Bell with Mr. Fuller.
 Mr. Klein with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Lynch with Mr. Schwabe.
 Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Merritt with Mr. Andrews.
 Mr. Price with Mr. Douglas.
 Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. Feighan with Mr. Ploeser.
 Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Jennings.
 Mr. Barden with Mr. Gale.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jonkman.
 Mr. Lanham with Mr. Keefe.
 Mr. May with Mrs. Luce.
 Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Willey.
 Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
 Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Schiffler.
 Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stockman.
 Mr. Lea with Mr. Shafer.
 Mr. Doughton with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Davis with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Hare with Mr. Knutson.
 Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Rowe.
 Mr. Bloom with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Courtney with Mr. Winter.
 Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Poulson.
 Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Wilson.
 Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
 Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Dewey.
 Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Phillips.
 Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Buffett.
 Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Carter.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and that that motion lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gathing, one of its clerks, announced disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 9, 11, and 12 to the bill (S. 1285) entitled "An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces

absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the House numbered 3, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GREEN, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BUTLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that that special order be transferred to Monday, and at that time I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars and include certain excerpts. That is, two insertions in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two articles, one by John O'Donnell and one by Frank C. Waldrop.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolutions, which were referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

PROGRAM FOR PLANTING GUAYULE House Resolution 346 (Rept. No. 1113)

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the progress of the program provided for in the act of March 5, 1942, for the planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward in a manner calculated to achieve such a domestic source in the shortest possible time.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress, at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, investigators, and other assistants, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as he may designate. The chairman of the committee or

subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

LOSS OF UNITED STATES NATIONALITY House Resolution 433 (Rept. No. 1114)

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4103) to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PLANTS TO PRODUCE SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUEL House Resolution 434 (Rept. No. 1115)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3209) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ADDITIONAL SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 381, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which is made in order by this resolution, provides for an Assistant Secretary to the Secretary of the Interior. As we all know, many additional responsibilities and duties have been given to the Secretary of the Interior, and I am informed by the committee that has held hearings on the bill that it is absolutely necessary he be given this additional help. I appreciate that years ago, before gentlemen on this side and some on the other side knew the qualifications and ability and courage of the Secretary of the Interior, there was much unjustifiable criticism of him, but today, after performing the duties that have been entrusted to him so well, so intelligently and courageously, I feel that we all recognize and appreciate that he is deserving of the aid that is provided in the bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman think the breaking of the Little Steel formula by the Secretary of the Interior is to his credit?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether he has broken it or not. It is not broken yet. I know he has striven to serve the country to the best of his ability. The position of an additional Secretary of the Interior is only for the duration and 6 months thereafter and is restricted to a compensation of \$9,000 a year.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have not heard the gentleman state the purpose of the resolution; that is, the need for the additional Secretary. What has brought about the need for the additional help?

Mr. SABATH. The need for this additional office is the burden that has been imposed upon the Secretary of the Interior by additional duties, such as problems relating to coal, oil, fisheries, geological surveys, and efforts to procure many materials for war purposes, duties which have been assigned to him by Congress, as well as by Executive orders of the President, and which duties I feel the Secretary of the Interior has tried to perform to the satisfaction of nearly all of the well-meaning American citizens having the best interests of the country at heart. I do not know of any man in the Government service who has worked harder, more intelligently, and more courageously than the Secretary of the Interior. Of course, some people think that he has a little too much courage and too much intelligence. Personally I admire a man who is not afraid to say what is in his heart. If someone hits him below the belt he goes right after him. Regardless of how influential a person or a press antagonist may be, he is not afraid; and I admire him for it. I wish we had more such men in the public service as the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] 30 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has already re-

requested that I speak out of order. I do not know that my remarks will necessarily be out of order. Apparently there is not a great deal of opposition to this bill in the Committee of the Whole or in the Committee on Rules. It has been kicking around for a long while. Even the distinguished gentleman who presides over the destinies of the Committee on Rules, I think, has had the rule for some months before he, in his judgment and great wisdom, decided to bring it out on the floor of the House. Apparently there is no rush for this highly important legislation. But I might say that I am entirely open-minded. If this is needed, of course, it should be granted by the House after discussion by the Committee of the Whole. There are some points in connection with this bill that I would like to discuss. All this bill does is to create an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. There is already an Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries. This creates just one more, just one more at \$9,000 a year, for some deserving Democrat. But not believing in any kind of partisanship or politics at any time, I am very glad, of course, in the desperation of the chairman, to help out the Democratic Party, to vote another \$9,000 job, for which, I am sure, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will be very grateful. I note that he is getting-up to thank me. I appreciate it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has so expressed himself. I know my friend would have no objection to a Democrat being appointed. If your party was in power I would expect a Republican to be appointed. I want to make this observation in all sincerity; I hope it is a Democrat.

Mr. FISH. I want to agree with you. I hope a Democrat is appointed. I much prefer to see Democrats appointed under your administration than pseudo-Republicans. We do not want to be blamed for these pseudo-Republicans that you have. You can keep them. You have them now and you can keep them.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a brief question.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This bill provides for more than an additional Assistant Secretary for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Ohio has discovered something in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This is also a pay-raise bill; and I shall speak on that point later.

Mr. FISH. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio will get time under the rule of the committee to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman from Michigan want to contribute something? I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to ask if your generosity is a sort of a going-away present. I did not expect that to happen.

Mr. FISH. I know that they are on the way out, but I do not like to rub it in.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit a question on the bill?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a question on the bill, if it is not too serious a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In reading the Secretary of the Interior's letter addressed to the Speaker he apparently primarily justifies the passage of this bill based on Executive orders which have created additional work in his department.

Mr. FISH. That does not surprise the gentleman from Michigan, does it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; but I would like to have the comments of the gentleman from New York on this question. If the President continually creates vast Government operations under Executive orders and we continually supplement that by creating official jobs, such as is here proposed, wherein does the responsibility of Congress begin and end?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss at some greater length the matter I originally rose to discuss here today. The Secretary of the Interior has announced to the press—I do not know if he has taken the Congress into his confidence or not, or whether he has appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House or the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—that he proposes to build in Arabia, from Persia, over the sands of Arabia, for 1,250 miles, a pipe line to the Mediterranean. Now, just where he gets the authority, or whether he proposes, after he has constructed it and paid for it, to ask for our permission, I do not know. But I desire to discuss that matter at the present time, which discussion, I think, is in order, for which reason I did not think it necessary to ask to speak out of order.

Certainly Members of Congress are entitled to the facts to find out whether this is a part of a new global planning or global and world-wide W. P. A. policy, or whether it is merely secret diplomacy, or whether it is just Ickes diplomacy. Possibly it is dollar diplomacy; we do not know on either side, I am sure, whether we may not be embarking on a program of imperialism or dollar diplomacy.

So I rise simply for a question of information to ask—of course, it is a little bit selfish on my part; I come from the great State of New York, and our people there totaling tens of millions in that section—New Jersey, New England, and New York—want more oil, more fuel oil, and more gasoline; we would like a pipe line, a pipe line, I might suggest to the gentleman from Illinois, which might run from the southern part of Texas to Chicago and then on to New York to supply the needs of over 40,000,000 Americans. I do not know how many Arabs they are going to take care of nor how many Arabs they are going to put to work on this Arabian W. P. A. project. I do

know, however, that it certainly is not a military project. It will probably take 2 or 3 years to build, and some of us hope the war in Europe will be over in 6 months or a year. This is nothing more than a project to spend the taxpayers' money to build a pipe line in a foreign land.

This sounds like an Arabian night's dream or more like a pipe dream than a reality. That is what the new dealers have told us they are planning to do. They are planning to spend our money when we cannot get enough to have another pipe line built from Texas to the East to take care of the actual needs of the people of that section of our own country.

Now, they will tell you there is no more oil in America. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and other Members from that State have heard this same old story for 25 years. They have said, "There will be no more oil in 14 years." They told us that 14 years ago. Now, they tell us the same thing. They then drill a little deeper and go down a few more thousand feet and they find a few more oil sands. They are now down to 10,000 and later on they will go down to 20,000 and they have and will continue to find oil sands. We cannot get the pipe to build another pipe line in America, although it is needed immediately, from Texas to New York, even if it does not go by way of Chicago. We can waive that. I only suggested that for the purpose of getting the chairman on our side, but they already have a little oil in Illinois.

Let us go back and see what this proposal really covers. Is this a commitment from the Teheran Conference or from the Cairo Conference? We heard a lot of ballyhoo about these wonderful conferences, but what do they amount to? What about the Atlantic Charter; that has disappeared now into thin air? You cannot find the Atlantic Charter any more. The Teheran Conference may turn out to be of even less importance than the Atlantic Charter. It may be just another of the administration's commitments that we know nothing about. We are trying to find out. They merely inform the Congress that they are going to spend millions of dollars. As is the New Deal custom they bandy millions around like they were nothing. This project alone may total \$400,000,000 before they get through.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The big oil companies have got the American people on the hip on this Iran pipe line, have they not? It has been said by the Senate committee which made an investigation, that 70 percent of the oil was being furnished by this country. They tell us now that if we want them to furnish the oil there we will have to finance the pipe line.

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. If we do not furnish the pipe line we will have to furnish the oil. They have got us either way it goes.

Mr. FISH. We have never lost a war and we have never won a conference.

That is what has always happened to us. This is not English oil, or Arabian oil, or foreign oil. It is the oil produced by three American companies, the Standard Oil Co., the Gulf Oil Co. and the Texas Co. in Arabia. The Government, as usual, is being free with our taxpayers' money and will pay for the pipe line. The American taxpayers will pay for it. If those big oil companies want to build their own pipe line there is nothing to stop them, but they want the Government to underwrite it. This is nothing but national socialism or fascism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York, Mr. FISH, has expired.

Mr. FISH. I will yield myself 5 additional minutes.

This is just the beginning of a world-wide plan for national socialism or fascism; the Government is using the taxpayers' money for the benefit of private enterprise, to build a pipe line that will be of no value to the American people after a couple of years.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. I commend the gentleman for criticizing the new pipe line that is proposed to be established by the Secretary of the Interior. I might venture the suggestion that if the Secretary of War were alert to the taxpayers' interests he would not want to befriend the Standard Oil of California, the executive vice president of which is Petroleum Administrator of War.

Mr. FISH. That is very interesting. I did not know that. The gentleman knows a great deal about it and I want to commend the gentleman publicly for what he is trying to do in this House, particularly for his efforts in trying to keep our own aluminum factories, in which we have invested over a billion dollars, in operation instead of spending about \$150,000,000 more to buy aluminum from Canada. This is the same principle involved as in the Canol pipe-line project in Alaska—another \$150,000,000. They can always find \$150,000,000 for any foreign nation, but we cannot find it for the benefit of our own people. For 2 days the House has been sitting here arguing and rearguing about the spending of \$20,000,000, and then Mr. Ickes pulls a rabbit out of his hat to the tune of \$150,000,000 to spend in some foreign land.

The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], who has just been appointed chairman of what I believe to be the most important committee in the House, a committee that has to do with post-war economic planning and policy, designed to devise a program for the future which will provide employment for 11,000,000 Americans who will come back from the war, and another 11,000,000 who will be demobilized from our factories. Certainly building this pipe line in Arabia will not put any soldiers back to work in America. If you are going to build pipe lines let us build them here in America for the benefit of the American people and provide employment to those who may be unemployed within the next 6 months or a year.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think that the history of the South Pacific would have been much better if we had sent \$150,000,000 worth of planes, food, ammunition, and quinine to the boys on Bataan and Corregidor?

Mr. FISH. Yes, and 50 of our destroyers, too. But I cannot cover that now. I am supposed to be talking about one assistant secretary at \$9,000 a year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have in my hand a resolution that I am introducing, a resolution of inquiry asking what benefits, if any, are to be derived from the pipe line in Persia, what our supply is, what will be needed in the post-war period regarding oil.

Mr. FISH. Why does not the gentleman introduce it and make one of her able speeches on it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is going into the hopper right now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement with reference to the expenditure of this money by the Secretary of the Interior. Does he not agree with me that the least that could be done is to bring this matter before the House and before the Congress and have it considered; at least have it given some consideration before we have an agency of the Government going out and agreeing to make a contract to spend this money?

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman in his wisdom understands what I am trying to do. That is all I am attempting to do. I am merely trying to bring this matter out into the open, to expose this secret diplomacy before the House, and have it referred to the proper committees, and have it considered in the House and Senate before they give away \$150,000,000 and make these unauthorized commitments and turn us into an international Santa Claus. There is one thing the people do not want, and that is a world-wide W. P. A. with our money wasted in foreign nations thousands and thousands of miles away from home. Go home to your districts and you will not find any of your constituents who are for things like that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask the gentleman this question. I think he is entirely in order in discussing the pipe line, because this letter cites four executive orders which have been issued in the Department of Interior and presented here in justification of this bill. Did not the Secretary of the Interior have some rather caustic remarks to make about the oil expedition that was made up in Canada?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under the direction of the Army?

Mr. FISH. Yes. You will find that this report covers the whole question of oil, solid fuels, and all of that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Canadian oil situation developed through secret negotiations?

Mr. FISH. Yes. Although we spent a large amount of money there they now find the war has moved 3,000 miles away.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Secretary of the Interior proceeds to do the very thing he condemned the War Department for doing.

Mr. FISH. And the Standard Oil Co. is behind both—both Canada and the new Arabian pipe line. It is a great thing to have the Government of the United States put up the money for the Standard Oil Co. to extend its pipe lines all over the world.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. The independent oil producers out my way are discouraged trying to get an increase of 35 cents a barrel for crude oil, yet they can go over there and spend \$150,000,000.

Mr. FISH. Oh, yes; they are not going to give anything for research or for the purpose of finding new oil here; that would benefit no one but our own people.

Mr. RIZLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, since he has brought it into this discussion, the purpose of this bill probably was connected up with this new policy that my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, who knows all about the oil business, together with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma have a resolution pending over in the other body to have this whole thing investigated by the Congress.

Mr. FISH. May I suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma, as a Member who comes from an oil district, that he introduce an identical resolution in the House, that he associate with him also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES]. These two Members come from oil-producing districts. I suggest that they introduce the same resolution in the House.

Mr. RIZLEY. Why did the Rules Committee let this thing come out?

Mr. FISH. This proposed pipe line is not in this resolution and it would not have come up except we were just using it as a vehicle to develop and discuss the issue. As long as we are trying to find out the facts, perhaps we might also find out something about the Teheran Conference when we delve into this oil project. We may even find there was such a commitment made at that Conference. I wish to read a few extracts from an article by Raymond Clapper on the Teheran Conference, so it can be recorded in the RECORD:

There must be a thrill for such powerful Allied leaders as they go into seclusion behind the secret portals to settle the affairs of the world, but they are slipping into a state of oriental arrogance regarding the interests of democratic peoples.

This is a most arrogant act on the part of Secretary Ickes, taking American money, the people's money, without the advice and consent of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Here is a statement by Dorothy Thompson, whom everyone will admit is a New Deal partisan. She wrote:

We received reiterations of noble phrases but not a single positive principle. Our Government is in extreme danger of boring the American people to excruciation, if it does not irritate them into blind opposition, because they do not take the American people into their confidence.

Not only 130,000,000 Americans, but the Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, are not taken into the confidence of the administration when they go out and make these commitments. Was this one of the commitments? Have we not a right to know?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Usually the gentleman is 100-percent right, but I am wondering if he is in this instance. Why should we discriminate against Teheran when we are building a pipe line up in Canada for the Canadians?

Mr. FISH. I suppose what the gentleman means to ask is, Why should we discriminate against one nation while we are so lavish with all the others?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think if we are going to be Santa Claus to one nation, we should not discriminate against another.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman suggests that instead of spending just millions on these boondoggling projects it ought to be billions—I know the gentleman does not really think that, but at least that expresses the fallacious New Deal idea, that we have unlimited money, that we can continue to drain the lifeblood and resources of America for all these foreign transactions, whether they call for \$150,000,000 or \$150,000,000,000.

Let us put an end to this; let us insist on being furnished with the facts. Let the Congress demand that Mr. Ickes come before it and give us the facts and prove his case before he is permitted to spend one single dollar for a foreign oil line for the benefit of private companies having sufficient resources of their own to build the same pipe line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REOPEN MAIL FACILITIES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND AREAS IN ITALY OCCUPIED BY THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call the attention of

the Congress to a very serious problem that faces Americans of Italian origin in the United States. Since Pearl Harbor they have not been permitted to communicate with their relatives in Italy or receive mail from them. There are very few of us of Italian origin who do not have close relatives in Italy; many of us have mothers, fathers, and brothers, not speaking of cousins, aunts, and uncles. We have learned through the news of the terrific destruction of towns and lives, particularly in the southern part of Italy. We have also learned of the terrible suffering of the civilian population in Italy. We are all anxious to know what has happened to our people there. We are not permitted to send or receive mail in any form or manner. It seems to me it would be not only humane but also a tremendous contribution to the morale of the people here, as well as the Italian people in Italy whose sympathies are thoroughly with the United Nations, if we would be permitted to receive news from our relatives and to send them news about ourselves. All that we ask is permission to receive from and send mail to people in the areas in Italy now occupied by the armed forces of the United Nations. We all know that there is a strict censorship on mail going to and from the United States. This would guarantee against the sending of any information that would be detrimental to the military interests of the United Nations. Consequently I have written to the President the following letter under date of January 31, 1944:

JANUARY 31, 1944.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You, I know, would be the first to give testimony to the unquestioned loyalty of Americans of Italian descent. Their contribution to our armed forces and to the battle for freedom on the home front match in every detail the records of other Americans. It is for this reason that I am addressing this letter to you to urge that through your good offices a way be found to facilitate the interchange of mail between American citizens and their relatives, who are Italians residing in Sicily and those parts of Italy now occupied by United Nations forces.

I represent a congressional district largely populated by Americans of Italian origin. Among my constituents there is a great and understandable anxiety concerning the fate of their blood kin in Italy. They cannot see, now that our forces have gained control of a substantial area of Italy why it is not possible for them to communicate with their relatives in this area, to ascertain their present status and their needs. If such exchange of mail were possible, I firmly believe that it would be a great contribution toward easing the worry of our people and would at the same time serve to strengthen the ties of friendship between Italians in this area and our troops now present in the area.

My suggestion is made, with full appreciation of the need to limit such an arrangement so as not in any way to create problems of security or inconvenience to our forces now fighting in Italy. Such a limitation, I believe, is possible and would prevent any difficulties that otherwise might arise.

You will appreciate, I am confident, the great joy that would be engendered among Americans of Italian descent and among Italians in Italy by such wise and friendly action on your part, I most earnestly urge you

to act favorably upon this suggestion at your earliest possible moment.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO,
Member of Congress.

I do hope that Members of Congress who are interested in this situation will also send letters to the President along similar lines urging that this humanitarian act be performed. It will be of immeasurable aid to the morale of our people here, to the Italian people in Italy, and it will be of considerable aid to our troops now fighting in Italy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SOMETHING WRONG

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with millions of men and women in the armed forces, with the lives of hundreds of thousands of men engaged in mortal combat and the issue of success or failure depending upon the production and transportation to them of sufficient munitions of war and food, the facts demonstrate that something is radically wrong with the administration's labor policy.

THE PRESIDENT'S LABOR POLICY

In recent days, more than one editorial has been written, charging that the President has no labor policy. That conclusion is erroneous. Since 1935, the record shows that the President has a definite labor policy. Stated briefly, it was, and it is, a policy designed to placate labor leaders, to grant labor organizations special privileges. In return, the President has received the political support of all but one of the outstanding labor politicians.

HAS FAILED

That policy has failed to end strikes, slow-downs, work stoppages, or to bring peace between employees and employers. The failure has been due to the administration's refusal to adopt, state, and adhere to fundamental principles which have guided our people, and to the further refusal to recognize the fact that the bosses, the labor politicians, neither think nor act as do the average, the overwhelming majority of American workers, who have sons, brothers, and husbands with the armed forces.

NO-STRIKE PROMISE

Not so long ago, President Murray of the C. I. O. and President Green of the A. F. L. and many another labor leader gave his solemn promise as did the unions by the action of their executive boards, that there would be no strikes in wartime.

HAS NOT BEEN KEPT

Whether that promise has been violated is not a matter for argument. It is

a matter of record in the office of the United States Secretary of Labor. That record shows that, in 1942, there were 2,968 strikes which caused a loss of 4,182,500 man-days; while, in the first 11 months of 1943, while our Army and our Navy were fighting abroad, we had 3,425 strikes and that the man-days lost were more than three times as many, and totaled 12,785,000.

Now, it is no answer to say that the time lost was only a fraction of the actual time worked. Nor is it an answer to point to the wonderful record of production.

NO EXCUSE FOR STRIKES

It was on Monday last, speaking at Kansas City, Mo., that A. F. L.'s president, William Green, said:

No matter how unjust conditions may become, no matter how sharp the aggravation may be, the members of the American Federation of Labor should realize that they must stay on the job and keep producing to the limit of their ability until final victory is won.

When the lives of our sons and brothers and loved ones are at stake, when victory in this war against hatred, tyranny, hangs in the balance, there cannot be any justification or excuse for any strike or stoppage of work.

BREAK IN SUPPLY LINE DANGEROUS

Industrial plants might be likened to ammunition dumps near the battlefield. Transportation might be compared to the lines of communication between the ammunition dump and the man in the fox hole at the front. We all know what would happen to the men at the fighting front if the ammunition dump is blown up or if the lines of communication are cut. The battle is lost and men lose their lives or are taken prisoner.

The same result—exactly the same thing—happens if industrial plants here at home are closed; if transportation lines are down.

THREATS WHICH DISCOURAGE

Yet it was only last December when the railway brotherhoods, for some reason unknown to the general public, threatened that, unless their demands were met by December 31, our national transportation system would be tied up.

That may have been an idle threat, but it was unfortunate and it resulted in the President, figuratively speaking, putting the Army for a few days in charge of the railroads.

CAUSES OF STRIKES

And strikes have continued—some of them due to delay and the conflicting action of Government agencies charged with the settlement of labor disputes; some of them due to factions in labor organizations and to jurisdictional disputes between unions, and some due to the actions of the union officials themselves.

WORKERS NOT DISLOYAL

It cannot with truth be charged that recent strikes and those which exist at the present time are due to the disloyalty of the workers themselves. The American worker—and I refer now to the industrial employees—is just as selfish, just as unselfish, just as patriotic as is the average citizen. He has at the fighting front—on land, on sea, under the sea, and in the air—his own flesh and blood—

sons, brothers, and husbands—and it is absurd to think for one moment that the overwhelming majority of those engaged in production and transportation do not want to win the war as quickly as possible, with the least possible loss of life, and that all are not hoping for the safe return of the loved ones.

STRIKES AS ENEMY PROPAGANDA

Nevertheless, we have had, and we have now, strikes which interfere with production. We have strikes out of which our enemies are making propaganda. Yesterday's press carried this caption: "Tokyo radio reports United States labor unrest"; then the statement that the Domei News Agency broadcast:

A dispatch from Fall River, Mass., said the United States Army took over operation of seven textile plants last night at the direction of Roosevelt, owing to a strike by independent unions.

LACK OF FAIR LABOR POLICY CAUSE OF STRIKES

One of the causes for strikes is laid squarely on the White House doorstep by John P. Frey, head of the metal-trades department of the A. F. of L., who recently urged the creation of a central clearing house to dispose of industrial disputes.

Frey made no attempt to defend or condone strikes. On the contrary, he stated that they were indefensible and intolerable. But he made it clear that, in his opinion at least, the end of strikes was not in sight. He said that labor had been forced to meet "an almost impossible administrative condition" in the Government.

He also said:

Those of us charged with labor responsibility frequently find it difficult to know which way to turn or to whom to go. Problems which should be settled accumulate and become enmeshed in the multiplicity of Government agencies and their conflicting policies and decisions.

COMMUNISTS CAUSE STRIKES

Another cause for trouble is the power which the Communists have acquired in the C. I. O. organization. It was on February 3 that here in Washington, Philip Pearl, A. F. of L. director of public relations and official spokesman, commenting upon certain action of the C. I. O., described it as "one of the most despicable betrayals" of organized labor "in the staggering record of treachery perpetrated by the Communist Party in America."

In his column, Facing the Facts, Pearl referred to Bridges and Curran as Communist leaders, and he added:

For the events of the last few weeks have proved even to the most broad-minded that several C. I. O. unions are infested with a type of verminous leadership that is dangerous to the health and safety of the workers of America.

Without conscience, without scruple, without the least vestige of principle, these so-called union leaders have betrayed the basic freedoms of the American labor movement in a major crisis.

A "united front" was presented on this issue—the draft-labor proposal—until the "Communist lice" spoke up.

First we heard from the illustrious Joe Curran, of the National Maritime Union, who

has been hailed far and wide as one of the great heroes in this war because of his successful fight to evade the draft. Mr. Curran announced that the patriotic thing for labor to do was to consent to enslave itself under the terms of the National Service Act.

This might have been considered merely an individual aberration, but then we heard from Harry Bridges, the supremely loyal leader of the C. I. O. longshoremen's union, who also has assumed heroic proportions in American life for his long and successful fight to evade deportation. Mr. Bridges also endorsed the draft-labor law.

And the C. I. O. can do without the counterparts of Russian trade unions. Unless it rids itself of the Curran and the Bridges, they will stab the C. I. O. in the back at every opportunity. And until the C. I. O. succeeds in delousing these unions, there is little hope of a united labor movement in America.

Read again the foregoing, and, as you read, remember those are not my words; those are the words of the A. F. of L. director of public relations and official spokesman for the A. F. of L.

NO EXCUSE FOR JURISDICTIONAL STRIKES

There is no need to cite illustrations of jurisdictional disputes, for all are familiar with many strikes growing out of such disputes, occurring sometimes between affiliates of the same union, sometimes between affiliates of the C. I. O. and the unions affiliated with the A. F. of L.

NEW STRIKES

The morning paper carries the news that 700 day-shift workers engaged in war work at the Bendix Aviation Corporation in New York walked out yesterday without, according to the press, giving any reason for the walk-out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to have the RECORD show at this point that the January 15 issue of the Nation carries a long article by Victor Johnson, who is a very important labor official in two of the big shipyards, and he makes the same complaint, that they will threaten to strike and they will continue to strike largely because of these delays in the departments down here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, and we get the same thing from the hearings before the Smith committee.

Yesterday's paper carried the headline, "United States takes over strike-bound textile plants," and the news story tells us that the strike began on December 13, when independent craft unions of skilled workers called their members out of 12 plants in protest against their inability to win bargaining points, notwithstanding an order of the W. L. B. that the men go back to work.

The strike grew out of the fact that a Government agency refused to permit the independent unions to bargain for their own members. Now the Government takes over.

RAIDING OF ONE UNION BY ANOTHER CAUSES STRIKES

According to the press, late last week approximately 50,000 skilled workers belonging to the Mechanics Education Society of America, an independent union,

went on strike and crippled war production in some 44 plants in Michigan and Ohio. This strike is due to the refusal of a Government agency to give the independent union an election to determine bargaining agents. It claims it is being raided by the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. and that its very existence depends upon an immediate secret election. It charges the N. L. R. B. with stalling and aiding rival organizations.

The independent union also complains because, while the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., and industrialists have members representing them on the War Labor Board, they have none.

FAILURE OF W. L. B. TO ACT CAUSES STRIKE

Another press dispatch of February 7 is captioned "3,000 foundry workers strike."

They are out in 40 factories. They passed a resolution stating:

We are striking in protest against passing the buck. Our wage-increase request has been approved by the employers but has been turned down by the Government and we can't get any satisfaction.

The strike may halt production of castings for landing barges.

The dispatch carries the further statement that Chester A. Sample, vice president of that particular union, said that the international will sanction the strike, although union officials have asked the workers to heed a W. L. B. appeal that they remain on the job.

The wage increase, although agreed to by the employers and the employees, was denied by a regional W. L. B. panel.

UNIONS CONDONE SLOW-DOWN

An illustration that the unions themselves are not free from blame but sanction slow-downs is found in the account given Monday, January 24, of trouble at the Edgewater, N. J., plant of the Ford Motor Co., where the C. I. O. has a bargaining contract.

Very few Members of Congress have not received from eye-witnesses written or verbal accounts of slow-downs in factories in their own or adjoining districts. Many such complaints from individuals I know personally have come to me.

In this instant case, two truck testers were involved in the dispute. Neil Smith and John Elvin are veteran employees. Nevertheless, because they turned out too much work, they were expelled from the union and, under the union's contract with the company, if properly expelled, would be discharged.

A letter from Bennett of the company to R. J. Thomas, president of the union, explains the situation. It reads as follows:

The ability of these men to do their operation speedily and efficiently in one-third of the time it has formerly taken aroused resentment among their coworkers and officials of Local 906 of your union at the Edgewater plant. Some of the officials and a number of other members of Local 906 approached these two men and told them that they must take 45 minutes to perform the operation.

When Smith and Elvin continued to perform the job in 15 minutes, the letter stated, members of the local "attempted to intimidate them with threats of bodily harm and expulsion from the union."

The union did expel them and demanded that the company dismiss them. Company officials reported that the 2 were each able to test between 22 and 24 trucks per day, while other drivers were able to test but 10 or 12 daily.

The union officials deny that the men were expelled because they worked too fast and charge that they had not been doing their work properly. Inasmuch as the company inspector made no complaints of the work, it may be that the union's charge of incompetency is merely a subterfuge.

Elvin has appealed to the President. He is the father of seven children, with a son in the Army. It will be interesting to see whether these men are protected in their effort to give their utmost to the defeat of our enemies.

CAUSE OF LABOR DISPUTES

In addition to the foregoing instances, hundreds—yes, perhaps thousands—can be cited. Now there must be some basic cause for all this labor trouble. Certainly it is not due to low wages, for wages today in industrial war plants are comparatively high.

It cannot be due to disloyalty or a lack of patriotism, for our workers are not only patriotic, but their own flesh and blood is on the fighting front and the lives of those who are near and dear to them are dependent upon production and transportation.

The cause goes further back than the beginning of the present war. It is deeper than dissatisfaction with either wages or working conditions. It cannot be wholly accounted for on the ground that the Communists are boring from within, although their methods, their procedure, is responsible for a large part of the trouble between employees and employers.

THE PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL TRADING

Much of the present trouble is due to the policy of the President of trading special privileges in return for political support. That is a serious charge. Unfortunately, the facts support it.

PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL BARGAIN

The C. I. O. has officially endorsed the President for a fourth term. Both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. supported him in his third-term drive. Both have contributed time, effort, speakers, writers, and money to the effort to defeat anti-New Deal Senators and Congressmen. Both have called for the defeat of two-thirds of the Members of the House and the Senate who voted for the Connally-Smith bill. Both have recently been engaged in a Nation-wide effort to prevent the reelection of Members of Congress who have opposed the President politically.

We all recall how even John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers contributed some \$700,000 to the campaign fund of the President, for his election and for the election of new dealers.

That end of the bargain is being carried out. Let us turn then to the other side of the picture and take a look at what the administration has done to further the interests of the three great labor organizations.

Prior to 1935 there was a practice among certain employers of requiring all employees to enter into a contract under which they agreed that they would not remain or become members of a union during the term of their employment. That was known as the yellow-dog contract and it was outlawed by the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia legislation, which prohibited the making of such contracts and which gave to labor immunity from the operation of injunctions except under certain special circumstances.

THE ADMINISTRATION LAID FOUNDATION FOR LABOR TROUBLE

Then, in 1935, came the Wagner law, or the N. L. R. A. It was hailed by organized labor leaders as their Magna Carta. A National Labor Relations Board was created to interpret and administer it.

The A. F. of L. of that day, which boasted that it was the father of the law, evidently thought that by it independent unions would be put out of business. But unexpectedly, on labor's doorstep was found a new baby, the C. I. O. Wet-nursed by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee; cared for and nurtured by the N. L. R. B., the C. I. O. experienced a phenomenal growth.

Without effective protest from Michigan's Governor or the Nation's President, the little C. I. O. baby had grown so strong that, on the 31st day of December 1936, with armed goon squads from without the State it was able to march into Michigan, violate the law with impunity, defy the peace officers and the National Guard of the State, and set at naught the orders of the courts.

Provisioned and armed, by force and through the exercise of violence it took possession of private property, of the streets of some of Michigan's cities, and from the 31st day of December 1936, to the 10th day of June 1937, it forcibly imposed its will upon hundreds of thousands of citizens of Michigan.

Spreading across the country like a pestilence, it brought disorder, violence, the denial of the protection of the Constitution, to the workers and the citizens of Niles, Canton, Massillon, Akron, and other Ohio and Michigan cities. Only the Governor of Indiana turned back the armed and marching forces when they sought to invade his State, until finally, after a reign of violence and bloodshed, Governor Davey, of Ohio, asserted that the State was supreme.

From that day to this; yes, down to the present moment, massed picket lines, with the protection of the Federal courts and the Federal administration, have prevented patriotic citizens serving their country, aiding in the defeat of our enemies, by performing their usual tasks in factory, mill, and mine.

The National Labor Relations law was unfair and was lopsided when it was enacted. It has been misinterpreted and maladministered. That is a charge which has been made against it by both the president of the A. F. of L. and of the C. I. O., as well as by hundreds of thousands of employers and employees who have been deprived of their just rights through its administration.

THE REMEDY

There is a remedy. It will be found in the enactment and enforcement of a just, fair labor law, which not only protects the rights of unions, of organized workers, but of the unorganized worker, of employers, and of the citizens generally.

The present law should be amended in at least five particulars:

First. It should be amended so that an employee has the right to join or not to join a union.

Second. It should provide that employees shall be free from coercion from any source—coercion by union officials and unions as well as by employers.

Third. It should provide for secret elections, conducted by impartial public officials who do not belong to the unions, who are not employers.

Fourth. It should provide for an appeal to a court and jury from all decisions of fact by the Board.

Fifth. It should contain provisions which, while protecting the right of collective bargaining and the right to peaceful picketing and to strike, should prohibit violence, sympathetic and jurisdictional strikes, and make unions, union officials, and union members responsible for and liable for damage growing out of violence or the violation of contracts.

There are many other secondary improvements which can be placed in the law. Inasmuch as the law and its administration has been condemned, not only by the public generally, by employers, but by the labor organizations themselves, it is long past time when the law should be rewritten.

As long ago as March 13, 1939, after weeks of study, I rewrote the N. L. R. A. and introduced a bill to repeal it and substitute the new version. Ever since, that bill, although reintroduced in succeeding Congresses, has reposed in committee, and action on it—even a hearing on it—is denied by the administration forces.

The labor disputes have grown in number; strikes have increased. Here we are at war, and the Congress of the United States lacks either the inclination or the courage to put on the books an over-all labor statute which would be at least an effort to end or lessen labor disputes; lessen the interference with our attempt here on the home front to give all-out support to our fighting forces.

Not only must the N. L. R. A. be drastically amended so as to give employees—nonunion as well as union—employers, and the public equal justice under law, but the administrative agency which interprets and applies it must be impartial, wholly divorced from the control of either the unions or employers.

THE AUSTIN-WADSWORTH BILL IS NOT THE REMEDY

The President's recent demand for the universal draft of manpower, if and when certain other conditions named by him had been brought about, to me lacks sincerity. Strikes, slow-downs, work stoppages, will not be prevented by the drafting of America's men and women, putting them under the control of a dictator.

Great Britain has a sweeping national service law. It has stringent rules for dealing with absenteeism and tardiness. Workers may not change jobs without the Government's permission. Every man and woman up to 40 years of age is subject to the labor draft and the Minister of Labor has authority to direct any person of any age to perform "any service that person is capable of performing at the prevailing rate of pay for the job."

Yet, last year, Great Britain had 1,775 strikes and the strikes in 1943 caused a loss of 1,800,000 man-days.

Everything that the English have is not necessarily good for us.

This administration is already exercising altogether too much arbitrary power. Our whole theory of government is based upon the principle that a free man will render greater service to his State than will the regimented individual.

That theory has demonstrated its soundness and simply because other peoples ruled by dictators are engaged in a bloody war is no reason why we should abandon the system which has placed us as a people above all other nations.

All our people need, all our people want, is the opportunity to guide their own destinies, to work out their own salvation. They have the ability, the courage, and the determination to win this war and to restore constitutional government in this land.

Once they can be assured that their Government will treat them fairly, that they will have equal justice under law, labor disputes, dissension, disunity, will be reduced to a minimum and we will go forward, united, and wholeheartedly make the defeat of our enemies, the reestablishment of American traditions, our first, our only objective.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make and the remarks I have made today, and include therein certain statements and excerpts, not including charts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRICE CONTROL HAS SAVED UNITED STATES
\$65,000,000,000 ALREADY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, upon the floor of this House and in the Senate, statements have been made that there is little danger of inflation; that fears expressed by Government officials over the danger of rising prices have been greatly exaggerated. The truth is that never in the history of this Nation has such a cloudburst of dollars rained down upon this country as is deluging it at present, and never has so large a proportion of the Nation's output gone off

to war. Never have such powerful inflationary pressures developed, and week by week they are piling up more and more powerfully behind the price-control dam erected by order of this Congress.

These facts I intend to prove, but first let us see what happened to the buying power of the dollar in the three other major wars in which this Nation engaged. In the War of the Revolution the buying power of the dollar shrank to 33 cents, in the Civil War to 44 cents, in World War No. 1 to 40 cents.

As a result, the value of investments shrank, fixed incomes were cut in half or less, war costs were vastly increased, war debts were needlessly expanded, and post-war price collapse created even greater hardships than wartime inflation.

This time, for the first time, Congress and the President decided that the Nation should not be subjected to the terrible ravages of wartime inflation. We erected for the first time a price-control dam.

In World War No. 1, as we have seen, the purchasing value of the dollar declined to 40 cents. This is how it happened:

In 1914 war orders were placed in this country, but few deliveries were made. Inflationary pressures had not begun to pile up and living costs increased only seven-tenths of 1 percent. In the next year, orders placed by our future allies began to inflate buying power, while taking away for war the extra goods produced. Living costs advanced to 7.8 percent, above the 1914 base. In 1917 we entered the war. Living costs rose to 28 percent above the 1914 base. In 1918 inflationary forces were powerfully at work. Now, living cost was over 50 percent above the 1914 level. By the end of 1919, living costs were 73 percent above the 1914 base. In 1920, inflationary forces engendered by the war finally carried living costs to a peak 108 percent above their 1914 beginning.

Now, \$2,000 is a little above an average income in the United States; but it is a good foundation for judging the effect of such an inflationary price rise upon fixed incomes. What was a fixed income of \$2,000 in 1914 shrank during this 6-year period, until at the 1920 peak it had a purchasing value of only \$960. It lost \$1,040 of its buying power. And do not think, Mr. Speaker, there were no heartbreaks in such a decline. Persons who had worked hard all their lives to build up annuities for their old age, stood helpless and saw them melt away. First, they cut down in their food, but soon that did not suffice. Then they cut their rent, by moving to poorer quarters. Their clothes grew shabby, but they could not be replaced. That is the tragedy which inflation brings in its wake.

But that was only a fraction of the damage done. War demanded iron, steel, copper, zinc, lead, coal, petroleum, and other materials in greatly increased quantities. Nowhere near the quantities demanded in this war, but great nonetheless. And without a price-control dam to hold inflationary forces in check, prices

began to soar. This chart shows some of the increases from 1914, when the war began, to the end of 1918.

Price increases first 52 months, World War No. 1

	Percent
Steel plates.....	181
Pig iron.....	145
Copper.....	93
Zinc.....	80
Anthracite coal.....	43
Bituminous coal.....	135
Lumber.....	71
Tin.....	156
Coke.....	171
Cement.....	75
Petroleum.....	200
Lead.....	106

These increases, of course, added largely to the cost of the war. In fact, the total cost of World War No. 1 was \$32,000,000,000. Of this, \$17,000,000,000 was a necessary cost; \$15,000,000,000 a price-increase cost. We still are paying interest on debts created by this price-increase cost.

Whatever goes up artificially, however, must come down. It took 6 years for prices to rise to the peak. It took less than 2 years for them to collapse. In the first year they dropped 32 percent. At the end of the second year they were 45 percent below the peak. And the results were tragic.

Factory workers' average take-home pay dropped 25 percent; from \$27.50 to \$20.70. Factory employment declined 31 percent and the total weekly factory pay rolls dropped from \$244,000,000 to \$136,000,000, a decline of 44 percent.

Farmers were hit hardest of all. Farm prices went all to pieces. These were the 2 years' declines:

	Percent
Wheat.....	65
Corn.....	78
Oats.....	71
Cotton.....	76
Potatoes.....	85
Rice.....	79
Peanuts.....	73
Lambs.....	61
Hogs.....	66
Beef cattle.....	57
Butter.....	53
Milk (wholesale).....	32
Eggs.....	73
Hens.....	39
Oranges.....	75

Recently, in a radio address, a distinguished Member of the House said, and I quote:

There was a general increase in the price level during the last World War that was much greater than anything that has taken place during a corresponding period in this war, but there was no inflation.

If there was no inflation in the last war, I wonder from just what heights did these prices decline?

In those 2 fateful years per capita farm income in the United States dropped from \$1,430 to \$554 and total farm income dropped from \$9,249,000,000 to \$3,603,000,000. And in the next 5 years 453,000 farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosures.

Just imagine what that meant in human worry and suffering. Four hundred

and fifty-three thousand farmers who started out with high hopes to build homes and safe incomes for themselves and their families losing their all. How many sleepless nights, how many hidden tears, how many suicides were wrapped up in those cold figures—four, five, three, zero, zero, zero. I for one want no repetition of such a catastrophe.

Business dreams, too, collapsed. Not for the most part dreams of big businessmen, but dreams of ordinary men, owners of little factories erected with high hopes, of little stores swept out, painted and opened to the public with dreams of growing big, of little repair shops, and tiny service stations. All the hopes wrapped up in them vanished in thin air, not due to failures of their owners but because of economic conditions over which they as individuals had no control. Post-war deflation did it to them. In the 5 years following the price collapse, 106,196 businesses went into bankruptcy, an increase of 47 percent over the average number before the war. The fact that business failures continued high during the last five speculative years of the 1920's brought not one of them back to business life.

Perhaps there are other Members who think there was no dangerous and damaging inflation during the last war. If so, I suggest they go back to their districts and talk to some of the farmers who lost their farms in those 2 fateful deflationary years, who have not forgotten the bitter experience of trying to repay with \$1.06 wheat mortgages placed when land values were based on \$2.98 wheat. Unfortunately, a new crop of farmers own those 453,000 farms now, or we would not have so many of them crying again for inflationary farm prices.

Fixed incomes cut in half, war costs multiplied, war debts piled up, post-war deflation wrecking dreams and creating paupers throughout the land—that is the price we paid for the last war's inflation.

This time, for the first time, the Congress and the President decided that the people need not be helpless victims of inflationary pressures. They decided to hold the waters from the economic cloudburst of this war in check. This time, for the first time, we erected a price-control dam.

It was well that we did so; for this time the economic cloudburst far exceeds that of the last war. In the last war, in the first 52 months, \$32,000,000,000 rained down upon the country. You have seen the result. This time, however, in the first 52 months, \$142,000,000,000 has rained down upon the country and it still is raining hard. The rain in 1944 will total some \$90,000,000,000. Public buying power after taxes was \$58,000,000,000 in the fourth year of the last war. This time it is \$124,000,000,000.

Unfortunately, only a fraction of the water is being drained off by taxes and the sale of bonds to the public. So month by month water is piling higher and still higher behind the dam. In the first three-quarters of 1943 alone, war expenditures exceeded taxes and bond

sales to the public by more than \$40,000,000,000.

Another measure of inflationary pressure is money in circulation. In the last war it increased from \$3,400,000,000 to \$5,900,000,000. In this war it has increased from \$7,200,000,000 to \$19,900,000,000, and it is climbing month by month.

Demand deposits, subject to check withdrawals, also rose far more than in World War No. 1. In the First World War they rose from \$10,082,000,000 on June 30, 1914, to \$14,843,000,000 in June 30, 1918. In the present war they rose from \$27,355,000,000 on June 30, 1939, to \$56,039,000,000 on June 30, 1943, and still they are rising.

At the peak of the war effort in 1918 only about 25 percent of all goods produced went to war. A considerably larger share was left for civilian purchase. In this war nearly one-half of all goods produced is going to war.

Evidence might be multiplied, but by now it should be evident to everyone that in comparison with those of any previous war the inflationary pressures of this war are gigantic. Had it not been for the price-control dam which the Congress and the President so wisely erected there is every reason to believe that the inflationary waters would have swept over our fair countryside, lifting prices above all previous flood-stage markers. Thank God, I say, for our price-control dam.

It was 19 months after the war broke out in Europe before the President, by Executive order, set up the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply. By that time the cost of living had risen 3.7 percent. It was 29 months after the war broke out in Europe before we passed the Price Control Act. By then living costs had risen 13.6 percent. It was 38 months after war broke out in Europe before we passed the Stabilization Act. By then living costs had risen 19.5 percent. Since then they have risen only 5.6 percent, and since April 1943, for the last 9 difficult months, the cost-of-living index has stayed practically stable, having risen only three-tenths of 1 percent.

With war expenditures in those 9 months exceeding the sums collected by taxes and the sale of War bonds to the public by \$27,400,000,000, and with currency in circulation increasing from \$16,250,000,000 to \$20,500,000,000, I consider that fact the most remarkable economic accomplishment in our Nation's history, if not in world history. For never in history did any nation build up such great inflationary pressures in so short a period of time, yet holding living costs in line.

But an even more remarkable job has been done in controlling the prices of basic materials entering largely into the cost of this war. Let me give you some figures. In this column you see percentage increases during the first 52 months of the First World War. In this column you see comparable percentage increases during a like period in this war. And in this column you see the peak increase

due to World War No. 1 inflation. Let me read the figures:

War materials price increases

	Percentage increases		
	World War No. 1 (51 months)	World War No. 2 (51 months)	World War No. 1 (inflation peak)
Steel plates.....	187	0	695
Pig iron.....	145	14	304
Copper.....	93	15	165
Zinc.....	80	70	345
Anthracite coal.....	43	26	65
Bituminous coal.....	135	22	264
Lumber.....	71	59	72
Tin.....	156	0	223
Cement.....	76	0	276
Coke.....	171	19	268
Glass (plate).....	81	0	81
Petroleum.....	200	13	215
Lead.....	106	29	195
Wool (wholesale).....	203	62	264
Cotton (wholesale).....	137	106	222

And here is an astonishing, almost unbelievable fact: If prices had risen in this war in the same proportion that they rose in the last war, this war instead of costing \$136,000,000,000 would have cost \$201,000,000,000. The net difference is \$65,000,000,000. And if we continue to hold the line this figure will by the end of 1944 rise to \$120,000,000,000.

And some people talk about the cost of O. P. A. and subsidies and the stabilization program. Why, gentlemen, the money this Congress has invested in O. P. A. is the best investment this Government or any other government ever made. In fact, 1 year's interest on the \$65,000,000,000 saved approximates the total cost of O. P. A. to date with the total cost of subsidies added. The return to the Government on its investment is about 3,000 percent.

There is a lot of foolish talk about subsidies. In fact, I cannot remember when such specious reasoning ever was presented to this Congress as has been going the rounds about subsidies.

Subsidies, my friends, are one stone, but an essential one, in the price-control dam. They are costing \$1,200,000,000 a year. Chester Bowles tells us that to hold food prices firmly in 1944 will cost \$1,500,000,000 in subsidies.

Now we are told that every cent spent for subsidies has to be borrowed and that therefore subsidies are inflationary. It is very true, of course, that every cent spent for subsidies has to be borrowed, just as every cent spent to build the levee through Portsmouth, Ohio, cost the taxpayers money. But to say that for that reason subsidies tend to send prices up is as false a conclusion as to say that the levee at Portsmouth represents a net loss to the people of that city. If the money spent on that levee had not been spent, Portsmouth last summer would have been inundated to its second-story windows at a cost of millions of dollars. And if the United States Government removes the subsidy stone from its price-control dam and lets loose the impounded flood it may very well increase the cost of this war by billions. Roughly every 1-percent increase in prices increases the cost of this war by a billion dollars.

One billion five hundred million dollars added to the pressures above the dam is an insignificant sum compared with the pressures already held in check. It can have no influence in increasing prices so long as the dam holds. But \$1,500,000,000 removed from the dam and eliminating the subsidy stone can have disastrous results. It may very well prove to be the most expensive billion and a half dollars Congress ever saved.

I hear it said occasionally that by keeping prices down subsidies increase people's buying power and so widen the gap between purchasing power and available goods. For this reason, it is claimed they are inflationary. The only conclusion one can draw from this is that if we want to hold prices down the way to do it is to let them go up, or if we want prices to go up we should hold them down. No more specious argument was ever offered to the Congress or the public. Pressures added above the dam do not send prices up, so long as the dam holds. And subsidies are one vital stone in the dam.

I hear, too, a great deal about the boys on the fighting front having to pay the grocery bills of those of us who stay home and prosper. The trouble with this argument is that what subsidies really buy are not groceries, but a stable living cost or an essential stone in the price-control dam. Remove the stone, set loose the flood, and the sum the boys will pay will not be \$1,500,000,000. It can well be measured in terms of \$50,000,000,000 or \$100,000,000,000 before the war is over.

Remember the story of the little Dutch boy, with his finger in the break in the dike? The danger was not from the small trickle that would have come through, had his finger been removed. The danger was that that trickle would become a stream, and that stream a flood. The price-control dam is like that. It is holding back a lot of water.

Let the Congress be warned. The inflationary pressures of this war are too dangerous for political bickering and group pressures. This, if ever, is a time for economic statesmanship. Whether we be Republicans or Democrats, let us first be Americans and protect the people of this Nation from a far greater disaster than was visited upon the Nation by the last war.

Of course, the stabilizers have made mistakes. The operation of price control and rationing is more vast in its ramifications and more complex in its problems than those of any 50 or 100 of our greatest corporations. Techniques have had to be developed from the test-tube stage. And the job has had to be done with a staff hastily assembled, with three bosses in its short life and with a complete change in price policy executives in the past 6 months, ordered by Congress. The wonder is not that they have made mistakes; the wonder is that they have been so few.

The mistakes and delays are trying, of course. But when I view the over-all result, I am amazed. It is the greatest economic accomplishment since the Continental Congress went into action. In worry and suffering saved it is one of

the greatest humane accomplishments of all time.

When this war is over 11,000,000 brave boys from the fighting forces, many of them crippled, will come back to be re-absorbed into jobs. It will be tragic in its consequences if we have to face that job, with prices collapsing about our ears. For the sake of the boys on New Britain, in Italy, and about to lead the great invasion of the Continent; for the sake of the boys bombing Berlin and about to bomb Tokyo, we must hold the line.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that those who have listened to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and who have followed the charts that he has presented realize that he has rendered a valuable service to us and to the country. I hope that everyone will find time to examine closely the information that he has given us as it will appear in the Record tomorrow, because it will be of great help.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I am sorry I cannot yield, as I have another matter that I desire to call attention to. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who at my request was permitted to speak out of order, utilized the time to assail the Secretary of the Interior because he contemplates a pipe line, but the gentleman did not say that it would be in the interest of the United States and would save us from shipping our oil out of the country. He heard this morning before the Committee on Rules that we have no surplus oil which we should send to other parts of the world. When the Secretary of the Interior advocated a pipe line to be built to supply New York and the East, from Texas to New York, to assist this section of the country, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] did not complain, and I believe that if we had acted in time on Secretary Ickes' recommendation many of the oil restrictions could have been avoided in the East and in New England. I believe he has used good judgment, and I know that he is not going to do anything which will be detrimental to the best interests of our country. As I said earlier in the day, I feel that he has rendered extremely valuable service to our country, and it can be relied upon that whatever he does or attempts to do is in the best interest of our Nation. Therefore, I feel that the resolution before us should be agreed to, and the bill it makes in order should be passed by the unanimous vote of the House.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2801, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior. At the present time there are two Assistants and this would make a third Assistant. The bill was carefully considered by the Committee on the Public Lands and had the vote of members on both sides. In fact, our committee went into the matter rather carefully. I realize from the debate upon the rule that many extraneous matters have come into the discussion. I realize that oftentimes many of us, including myself, have been critical of the acts of the Secretary of the Interior; and in presenting this bill today I make no brief for his acts. I am not here to defend him and I am not here to indict him. But upon the basis of the facts and a careful consideration of the facts I am thoroughly convinced he is entitled to this additional assistance. During his tenure of office as Secretary of the Interior, there have been many additional duties placed upon him. Some of those duties have been placed upon him by Executive order and some have been placed upon him by the Congress itself. Some of the duties have been placed upon him by Executive order after congressional committees had acted and were in the process of imposing those duties upon him. I might mention a few of the problems, the problem of solid fuels, of oil, and of the fisheries. The question of fisheries is a big problem. I happen to know of that by reason of my service on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Then there is the problem of the administration of the Explosives Act. I happen to know something about that because I handled the legislation which amended the present Explosives Act. I will give you some idea of the volume of that in a few minutes.

Then he has had to handle the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and other matters in connection with war work. Those are some of the things in connection with the war effort that we have placed upon him.

Bear in mind that a mere clerk or person with no statutory responsibility cannot sign any of these orders. As you know, as a Member of this House I have not been one of those who rush to a decision. I have tried to consider things carefully before I act. I think the Committee on Public Lands have the confidence of the House because they do carefully consider matters. I asked for some facts as to what has been happening and for information as to the volume of work that has been placed upon the Secretary of the Interior. I mentioned many of the agencies that have been heaped on him. I find that in the task of administering the Federal Explosives Act alone there are more than

200,000 licenses which have been issued to persons manufacturing, selling, and using explosives. That is new work which has come in by reason of the war conditions under regulations and laws passed by the House itself. In the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1942, the Secretary acted upon and approved over 2,210 cases and items of correspondence; the Under Secretary, 3,900; and the Assistant Secretary, 9,900.

In the previous 6-month period the First Assistant Secretary acted upon and approved almost 4,800 cases and matters. In the same months of 1942 the items amounted to about 500 per month for the Secretary, 700 per month for the Under Secretary, and 800 per month for the First Assistant Secretary, and over 2,000 per month for the Assistant Secretary.

Now, regardless of whether or not you agree with the Secretary of the Interior or whether or not you like him, the situation is that we have actually placed this work on him, and he is entitled to this Assistant's help. I am thoroughly convinced of that.

The Members of the House know I have not been one of those to defend many of his acts. You probably recall I was able, on occasion, to get certain limitations put on his appropriations. At times I have disagreed with him. But as a matter of fairness and decency when we give him the work to do, we should see that he gets adequate assistance to do it.

Although this bill creates one new Assistant Secretary, making three in all, there is a provision in it which places them without numerical distinction. That is, frankly speaking, so that a man who comes all the way to Washington will not have to see the "Third Assistant Secretary." It is a matter of psychology. They will all be "Assistant Secretaries" instead of "First," "Second," and "Third Assistant."

There is a provision with reference to salary. Frankly, that is the only objection I have heard. I understand some of the gentlemen on the other side will discuss that particular item. Under the Classification Act at the present time, I am informed, the present Assistant Secretaries get \$9,000. I will not go into that detail now. I will make a short statement later, because I understand one of our good friends and colleagues on the other side will make a statement with reference to that. That is roughly the situation. I could give you more of the details, but I think I have covered the situation.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true, then, that the question is not whether we approve of the Secretary of the Interior or not, but rather, Do we need this Assistant Secretary? Is it not also true that small-business groups have written to members of the Committee on Public Lands, or at least they have written me, requesting that this appointment be made, as they feel it will immeasurably assist them in the problems facing small business today?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; the gentleman is eminently correct. We should not let our like or dislike of the Secretary color our views.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The chairman of the Committee on Public Lands has called attention to the importance of this particular bill. I recall several weeks ago that that same committee reported out a far more important bill so far as the people of the country are concerned, which was introduced by the gentleman from Wyoming, and which would have sought to nullify the creation of the Teton National Monument. Can the gentleman tell us when there is some likelihood of that very important bill being submitted to the House for action?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I do not know at the present time, but I will be glad to confer with the gentleman from Wyoming. The report has not been written in that particular case. It was ordered reported, however.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us in brief what are going to be the duties of this new Assistant Secretary?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. He will have a variety of duties, of course. At the present time there are many matters relating to fisheries and matters relating to oil, public lands, coal, and so forth, which go to a different one.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When the gentleman mentions fisheries, I am particularly interested in that.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows some of the problems we have had regarding fisheries and the Fish and Wildlife Service. They have had an immense amount of work, and some of these orders finally have to go on up to the Secretary's office.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I know what fine work the gentleman from Florida has done in regard to the problem of fisheries. But he also knows no division within the Department of the Interior has been subjected to more justified criticism than the Fish and Wildlife and Fisheries Division. I would like to know whether or not we are going to get some relief and whether some real work will be done in behalf of commercial fisheries in the Department of the Interior if this bill becomes law.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I am hopeful of that. Whether rightfully so or not, the Fish and Wildlife Division was a combination from other departments. It was placed in the Department of the Interior, part coming from the Department of Commerce and part coming from the Department of Agriculture. The Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries were combined.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Florida think it is a good thing to separate them once more? Let us have a Commercial Bureau of Fisheries instead

of combining that operation with a lot of insect investigations.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It has been considered. There may be merit to the suggestion, but I would rather not go deeply into that discussion at the present time.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, evidently the people who have in mind creating this new office of Assistant Secretary of the Interior must have some individual in mind whom they want to place in that position. Can the gentleman from Florida tell us whom they expect to appoint?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No; I cannot. I have no idea whom they intend to appoint. I am proceeding on the basis of whether they do have a need for the office or not. I do not know whom they intend to appoint.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thought perhaps the committee might have gone into that matter. I have no justification for the rumor, but several Members have asked me today if I had any idea that either Mr. Dodd, Mr. Watson, or Mr. Lovett were going to be appointed to that position.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Certainly I would oppose any one of those gentlemen.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman will yield to me I think I can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. All I can say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is that he will find the answer in the bill. The Assistant Secretary is to be appointed by the President. The last time we had legislation of this kind before the House it was expected that Mr. Berlew would be the recipient but it did not turn out that way at all, and the thing is entirely in the hands of the President.

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] but I still say I thought perhaps it was brought out in committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No, sir; it was not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] raised a question about the fisheries. One of the Executive orders deals with fishery coordination. Since the fishery coordination on July 21, 1942, have the people of the United States been supplied with a greater quantity of fish or a less quantity of fish?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I do not have the complete figures here, but I will say that a greater portion of the blame lies with O. P. A. and not entirely on the Department of the Interior, as a result of certain information which O. P. A. had, but the fishery matter will be made the subject of an intense study. I started an investigation of the fishery situation and in a few days there will be a resolution before the House on that question. I found the Interior Department, through its Fish and Wildlife Service, very cooperative.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would it be fair to assume by that reply that the fishery coordination scheme has not been a success up to date?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I would not say that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then why investigate?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The investigation is the result of certain facts and a need for a complete picture of fishing problems, and before we complete the investigation I would not want to prejudge.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The facts are there have been actually hundreds of thousands of pounds less fish landed within the last month than at the same period a year ago.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is my understanding.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Much of that was due to the fact that the Government had taken over the boats.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. Part of that was due to that, and part was due to the O. P. A. regulations.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I understand, this new Assistant Secretary is going to devote part of his time to the development of these problems and the solution of problems pertaining to the commercial fisheries of the country. They have been given but very little attention.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. I will make that request of the Secretary, as chairman of the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. As I remember, during the last session of Congress we passed a bill giving an additional staff to Dr. Gabrielson, who is in charge of the fisheries, to handle the problems of the fisheries and to coordinate with the military officials relative to that matter. I am wondering if that staff has not been able to work out the problems that the Interior Department said they had last year.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The staff has been working on it but many new problems have arisen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the history of this proposed legislation is, in my opinion, rather unsavory. As I recall, it was first introduced in the House last July as H. R. 2801.

Also, as I remember, a long letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, accompanied the report on that measure, wherein it was contended that another Assistant Secretary was essential

to that Department. The bill provided for the elimination of grades or ranks of the Assistant Secretaries of the Interior Department and further for a uniform salary of \$9,000 for each Assistant. On going into the matter I found that the initial salary of the lowest grade Assistant was \$8,500. Thus it became apparent that Mr. Ickes' request as embodied in the bill was for more than an additional Assistant. It was also a pay-raise measure.

I objected to the bill at that time because I felt it lacked forthrightness. I think heads of departments when they make requests of Congress should be honest and lay their cards on the table face up. The present bill is in all respects similar to H. R. 2081 heretofore mentioned.

Having paid some attention to the enormous bureaucratic growth and cost of operating the Interior Department, I am reluctant to granting this request for an additional Assistant. The Secretary of the Interior refuses to make any savings where he could. He could eliminate costs amounting to millions of dollars annually without harming in the least the Interior Department. I should not wish, of course, to be responsible in any degree for withholding needed help to any of the Departments at this time. But it has been stated by competent men, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] that other departments such as the War and Navy Departments, are getting along without such additional assistance as the Secretary of the Interior requests here, though their work is just as heavy.

There is absolutely no regard, so far as I can see, by any of the bureaus for costs or manpower. The Congress just must take these matters in hand if there is to be any hope whatever of bringing Government costs and operations within the limits of reason and real need.

You will recall that it was the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] who objected to the unanimous-consent request that was made for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not a fact that since the beginning of the war and on account of the war, both the Army and the Navy have been given a number of Assistant Secretaries?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have not looked into the matter myself. I am stating from memory what the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] said, which I think you will find in the Record.

Mr. MOTT. I will say for the information of the gentleman that the answer to my question is in the affirmative.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Now, complaint has been made on the floor that Mr. Ickes has embarked on the construction of a pipe line for carrying oil 1,200 miles in Arabia, and that possibly he is undertaking this project without any legal authority. Furthermore that this might be a part of a global W. P. A. program. Almost every Member of this House goes back to his district and complains of the bureaucracy in Washington and of its

arbitrary exercise of power; complains also that the departments of Government have grown to a size that is wholly out of line with what is really needed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I recall when they built a new 20-inch pipe line and a 24-inch line that the cost was about \$90,000,000 for about 1,600 miles of pipe line in this country.

I read an article in the paper stating that this new Arabian pipe line would be about 1,200 miles long and would cost \$116,000,000. I do not know what authority he has to build that line but it seems to me it would be better to develop our own oil resources in this country, to move it to the eastern seaboard where we so badly need gasoline, kerosene, and fuel oil.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is no question at all that the people throughout this country want this bureaucratic growth stopped. They not only want the growth of bureaucracy stopped but they would like to see its size greatly reduced. There is only one way to accomplish these wishes of our people and that is by withholding from the heads of our governmental departments funds and personnel. Of all the forces now operating to make the United States into a socialistic, communistic, or fascistic state, I consider Mr. Harold Ickes one of the worst. I think it is Mr. Ickes' intention to nationalize the whole oil industry. I do not propose to vote for any measure which has the least prospect of making it possible for him to accomplish that purpose, and I therefore plead with this House that we stop and seriously consider this proposal. Our duty now I think is to respond in a degree to the wishes of the people throughout this country and do something to stop the further socialization of our economy that is proceeding apace.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I should just like to say to the gentleman that I am in no way attempting to defend the 1,250-mile pipe line, but I do feel in all fairness that it should be said that the money spent for it will in time come back to the Government. It is my understanding that this is more of a subsidy to get the oil with the understanding that in time it will be returned to this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he knows where any records can be found supporting the contention that this money will come back to the United States?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is speaking of the pipe line?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am speaking of the pipe line or any of these other advances we are making wherein we are not satisfied with having the Government take over the ownership, operation, and management of all industry in this country but we have to extend our

financial arms into every spot on the face of the earth and try to take over their operations too. That is what I am opposed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I of course do not know where any such records may be found.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would not take the time of the House today if it were not for the fact that during the last session of Congress the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee denied Mr. Ickes money to build a transportation line from Shasta substation to Oroville in California. An amendment was offered to the bill when it came to the floor of the House by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to place that back in the bill. The House took a clean vote and we defeated the amendment. It was taken up in the Senate and finally the Senate decided to let the conferees handle the matter. We did and agreed to leave it out of the bill entirely. But regardless of that, regardless of the action of Congress in denying funds to build that transmission line, Mr. Ickes went ahead and built it. I am a little surprised that he should ask us to give him an additional Assistant Secretary. I am sorry more members of the subcommittee are not here for I am sure they would bear me out in what I have to say. I am surprised that he should ask for another Assistant Secretary because he has paid so little attention to the will of Congress. He asked for nine hundred-and-some deferments in his Department. The subcommittee and the Congress saw fit to reduce his request to such a point that a number of those he had asked be deferred were naturally taken off the pay roll and many of them are now in the service. His former Under Secretary, Abe Fortas, a very able man, went into the service but I understand was rejected because of physical disabilities and will be back with Mr. Ickes. Just why we should give Mr. Ickes an additional Assistant Secretary now is beyond me, because I think if he would spend his time looking after the affairs Congress has directed him to look after instead of going out and building a transmission line for which Congress denied him money, and building or getting ready to build pipe lines all over the world he would not need an additional Assistant Secretary.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I well recall the vote about a year ago in the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee recommending against the building of the transmission line from Shasta power plant. The House very decisively turned that matter down. The Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations have since held hearings. What has Mr. Ickes or his Department had to say with regard to going ahead in the meantime notwithstanding the previous action of Congress in denying funds for building

that transmission line? What is his answer to it?

Mr. JENSEN. I may say that the committee has not held hearings since that time, but we are going to ask Mr. Ickes some very pointed questions when we sit again the latter part of this month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, among the other duties of the Secretary of the Interior comes the administrative work in connection with irrigation and reclamation projects. Those of us from California, and particularly those connected with the metropolitan water district, have felt the heavy hand of the Department in practically forcing us to give up certain of our rights in order to obtain equity and justice in our rates, but for the time being I will talk about some other things.

On last Friday there appeared in the Washington papers the report that a new treaty had been signed between the United States and the Republic of Mexico concerning the disposition of the waters of the Colorado River and the Rio Grande. That was the first intimation that nearly all of us here in this body from California had that there was to be any special disposition to Mexico of the waters of the Colorado River. It was understood by us in the Boulder Dam Act and the Colorado River compact, which was approved by this Congress, that the rights to use of the waters of the Colorado River basin were for the use exclusively within the limits of Colorado River basin States.

It was provided in section 3 (c) of the compact, however, that if any agreements were made for the disposition of any of the waters to the Republic of Mexico in international comity they were to be assigned from the surplus waters if such were available, otherwise any deficiency would be made up proportionately by the various States. Historically the Republic of Mexico has used in the delta region of the Colorado River something in the neighborhood of six to seven hundred thousand acre-feet of water per annum. It is my understanding, although I have not seen the treaty, that in the treaty it is provided that 1,500,000 acre-feet of water be given of what we call firm water to the Colorado Delta region within the Republic of Mexico, in Baja California, and Sonora.

Mr. Chairman, we can talk all we like about the good-neighbor program, but, Mr. Chairman, water to the West is more valuable than gold. A million and a half acre-feet of "firm" water is worth at least \$200,000,000. But you cannot buy water with gold unless the water is available. You cannot make it rain upon those mountains any more than it does and the precious fluid that comes down waters the fertile valleys and enables us out there in the far West to grow the early winter fruit and vegetables that you people in the East enjoy so much, and the people need it for domestic purposes. We depend on it. I could give you a summary and I would like to have

the time to give you a summary of the disposition of the waters of the Colorado River, under the terms of our compact, but suffice it to say in summation that as the State of Arizona last night signed the Colorado River Compact—the Governor of that State was here and I understand left this morning—it completes the compact, all seven States having signed it.

If this further disposition of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water is to be made to the Republic of Mexico as "firm" water prior to the various rights of the other States, it will be a terrific loss to my own congressional district, to the metropolitan water district of California, and to the city of San Diego, to the Imperial Valley, the Coachella Valley, the Gila Valley of Arizona, and all of those other fertile valleys, as well as to the upper basin States. We cannot get along without it. Without water our country is a forbidding desert.

I wonder what the Secretary of the Interior is doing to protect the rights of these States in this exceedingly important water question. I wish that I might have more time in which to discuss it. However, permit me to say that on Tuesday of this week I introduced House Joint Resolution 232, calling upon the Secretary of State to conduct negotiations toward the purchase of Lower California and a small part of Sonora from Mexico. If that were accomplished, this question could be settled and great benefits bestowed upon all parties. That is, in my judgment, the right solution to that issue as well as to our need for Magdalena Bay for national-defense purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, during this hour of debate on the bill and during the preceding hour of debate on the rule, we have listened to some very interesting speeches. With the exception of the remarks of the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the committee, however, there has been very little discussion, if any, which has been directed to the bill under consideration.

Now, it seems to me that in the consideration of the simple matter which is presently before the House it makes not the slightest difference whether one happens to like the Secretary of the Interior or not, or whether one happens to agree with certain of his policies. I have been a member of the Public Lands Committee for 11 years. As my colleagues know, I have disagreed vigorously with many of the Secretary's proposals, with most of his philosophy and with many of the measures which he has suggested during that time. When I have opposed such measures I have done so because I thought they were wrong. On the other hand, I have agreed with some of his proposals and with some of the measures which he has advocated, because I thought they were right, and when I have thought they were right I have supported them as vigorously as I could.

This bill certainly has nothing whatever to do with the philosophy of the De-

partment of the Interior or of its Secretary. It has nothing to do with the building of pipe lines, with foreign policy, or with anything else which has been discussed here, except the question whether the Secretary of the Interior at present need in his Department an additional Assistant Secretary. That was not a very difficult question for the committee to decide. With the committee's report before you it should not be a very difficult matter for the House to decide.

The Public Lands Committee is composed of men interested in the question of public lands and in the other matters within the normal jurisdiction of the Interior Department. It is about as nonpolitical a legislative committee as can be imagined. The membership of the committee along political lines is almost equally divided. No one has ever heard any discussion in that committee of anything having to do with party politics.

This matter was fully presented to the committee on its merits. It was examined thoroughly, and after full hearings the committee reported this bill out favorably by a unanimous vote. So I say, Mr. Chairman, especially to those on this side of the aisle, I hope no one will consider it from a political angle and I hope no one will be intrigued by anything that has been said here which was not directed to the merits of the bill itself.

If you will refer to the committee report on the bill you will find a very concise statement as to why, in the opinion of the committee, an additional Assistant Secretary is needed in the Interior Department at this time. Most of those reasons, I should say, require no argument, because they are apparent on their face.

When the war started there were two Assistant Secretaries in the Department of the Interior. Since that time the work of the Department of the Interior has been very greatly increased. You will find a list of the new duties and activities that have been given to the Department of the Interior since the war started. One of the most important of those new activities is the Solid Fuels Administration for War; then there is the Office of Fisheries Coordination; there is the Federal Explosives Act; and there are many other activities which have been vested in this Department solely by reason of the war. In addition to that, some of the old agencies of the Department have had to assume a great deal of additional work on account of the war. The Mining Bureau is a case in point, and there are a great many others.

There is at present an Under Secretary of the Interior and two Assistant Secretaries of the Interior. The testimony before the committee is that the increased volume and the expanded scope of the work which the Department is required to transact now by reason of the war cannot be properly conducted by these two Assistant Secretaries alone.

The testimony also shows that much of the work which is now being done, the new work, is work which properly should be done on a secretarial level, and you

will find a very clear statement on that point in the report. For these reasons it is the opinion of the committee that it would be to the betterment of the Department and to the advantage of the country, during wartime, if the Secretary of the Interior were permitted, for the duration of the war only, to have an additional Assistant Secretary, who would draw the same pay as the present Assistant Secretaries draw now. And in this connection I direct your attention to the fact that the bill specifically provides that the additional office provided in this bill shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities.

So far as salary is concerned, and there has been some reference to it in the debate, if there is any objection to the amount I am sure the chairman of the committee and the committee itself would be very glad to accept an amendment which would strike out all reference to salary, because the salaries of these Assistant Secretaries are determined under the Classification Act any way. They are all, I understand, getting \$9,000, the amount named in this bill; but the bill could just as well provide that the salary should be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act. It would be the same in either case. That is a matter of minor importance. The only important issue here is whether, under all the circumstances, as disclosed at the hearings and concisely outlined in the committee's report, an additional Assistant Secretary is needed at this time in the Interior Department. It is the unanimous opinion of the committee which heard the evidence that an additional one is needed. We trust that the House may concur in this opinion and pass the bill, and we believe it will.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not considered that Mr. Ickes has administered his Department efficiently, whether or not you agree with his views?

Mr. MOTT. Compared with other Administrators in the executive agencies of this Government at the present time, I should say yes. And I might go even further and say that now, after 10 years of experience with the alphabetical agencies and the men who make and administer their policies, most people would be inclined to consider Mr. Ickes, by comparison, as almost a conservative.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Regardless of what we think of Ickes, what does the gentleman think Ickes thinks of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MOTT. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina, what Mr. Ickes may think of the Congress of the United States has no more to do with the issue involved in this bill than what the Congress of the United States, including the gentleman from South Carolina, may think of Mr. Ickes. The only question involved here is whether the

Department of the Interior needs an additional Assistant Secretary during the war period.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The United States Code, Annotated, page 483, provides in the Department of the Interior a First Assistant Secretary of the Interior and an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Is the gentleman prepared to state to the House that the salaries of these underofficials are \$9,000 at the present time?

Mr. MOTT. The salaries of the two Assistant Secretaries are \$9,000. The Third Assistant, if this office is created, will receive \$9,000 also.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will not the gentleman agree that regardless of how many Under Secretaries Mr. Ickes would have he would still be absolutely 100 percent in authority, and would do exactly as he thought should be done regardless of what any Under Secretary said?

Mr. MOTT. I am sure the gentleman understands that that is the policy which all department heads under the present administration try to follow. Sometimes they do not succeed, but they all try.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. By the establishment of this salary by law are we not taking it out of the purview of the Classification Act, to which the gentleman referred?

Mr. MOTT. It is possible the language of the bill could be so construed. It seems to me also that it might possibly be construed as a limitation upon the salary which could be fixed under the Classification Act. I understand the Civil Service Commission under the Classification Act is not presently limited in the amount of salary it may fix. However, if that is considered by anyone to be really an important point, as I said a moment ago, I am sure the committee would be perfectly willing to accept an amendment striking out all reference to the amount of salary, and providing that the salary should be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. This bill seems to carry a mandatory provision that the Assistant Secretaries shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of \$9,000 per annum. If that is not a mandatory provision of law, then I do not know what is.

Mr. MOTT. They are receiving \$9,000 now.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the Classification Act?

Mr. MOTT. That is right, but the Classification Act alone, I understand, the salaries could go higher. Under this bill they could not. The provision, as the gentleman says, is mandatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, under the Classification Act the Assistant Secretary now gets \$9,000, but if there is any question in the mind of any Member of the House about that and an amendment is introduced to strike that provision from the bill, I may say as chairman of the committee that I will not oppose it.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GIBSON. Does not the gentleman believe that if we pass this bill Mr. Ickes would hold it to be unconstitutional, just as he did our action regarding Dodd, Lovett, and Watson?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate during this hour with great interest and solicitude. Some of the debate was by permission "out of order" and some of it did not even pertain directly to the bill. I was greatly impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I was very much informed by the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. Part of what the gentleman from California had to say is as new to me as it had been to him regarding the treaty arrangements with Mexico and its provisions concerning the waters of the Colorado River. I have not yet seen that treaty but I assure my friends in California that I am as much interested in it as anyone in the Colorado River Basin can possibly be.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I want to strengthen the hand of the Secretary of the Interior, for his work within our domain, and not that he may go abroad and build pipe lines all around the world. That is something else and not related to this bill. The Interior Department is one of the great Departments of this Government loaded with responsibility and rich in possibilities. It needs good management and able administration. I have often quarreled with the Secretary on both policy and practice, but I do believe he needs additional help to carry properly his present load.

Now, I cannot be too emphatic about the tremendous importance of an adequate and well-trained staff for this great Department. It would take hours of time even to begin to enumerate what a storehouse of wealth the public land States contain for the benefit of the Nation and which are held in trust, so to speak, by the Secretary of the Interior as the servant of us all. Ours is a young nation, and even so we have had a marvelous history. Our economic history is as amazing to the world as is our political history. Certainly the development of

our Nation economically presents to the world some wonderful object lessons, many of which are worthy of imitation elsewhere. Of course, some of them are warning of what not to do. However, the western part of this country comprising that portion under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department is only slightly developed, relatively, considering its possibilities. Upon its full and proper development hinges the prosperity of this country. That proper development depends largely upon the brains, the statesmanship, and the patriotic businesslike management of high officials in the Department of the Interior. No business corporation has the assets and the resources comparable to our Government in that great Department over which Secretary Ickes presides. When will America realize this potential wealth?

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] spoke out of order a few minutes ago and made a comparison of war costs between the First World War and the present war, and also compared the volumes of money and national debts in similar periods of the two wars, he caused me to do a lot of thinking. We have all been thinking seriously. How can this present astronomical debt ever be paid? I have heard pessimistic souls declare that it cannot be paid. On the other hand, I have heard level-headed businessmen declare that it can be paid—if. Now, that "if" is a long story but it presupposes some mighty efficient handling of America's resources. These same optimistic souls tell us that the business genius of the American people, if given free rein and unhampered except by the minimum of police regulation, will create new wealth quickly and absorb the debt with ease. I want to believe that such is true, and I feel that I may believe it—if. Now, my "if" involves a proper emphasis upon our national storehouse of natural resources lying untouched or barely scratched in the West. Let me give an illustration.

An unusually well-informed gentleman told me just yesterday that since Thomas Jefferson gave us the West with only a very small investment and since Theodore Roosevelt started one phase of western development with a similar very small investment, we have converted 20,000,000 acres of desert land into a highly productive domain under irrigation. Remember, this 20,000,000 acres includes 226,000 acres within an hour's automobile ride of my home which, during the last 12 months, produced \$30,000,000 worth of food and fiber. Think of an average yield of \$129 per acre in 12 months. This same thoughtful gentleman declared that within the lifetime of most of us now living we could and should double the acreage of irrigated land in the West and make it 40,000,000 with similar results. Even then we would not have as many irrigated acres as there are unirrigated but cultivated acres in the State of Iowa. Just think of that. I have mentioned but one of a dozen aspects of economic development of which the great West is capable under private American enterprise and good administration.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard complaints about the Secretary and complaints about the salary of this proposed new member at \$9,000 a year. Let us pay no further attention to what Ickes may be doing abroad while considering this bill, for there is no relationship between them. Let us overlook our petty differences of opinion with regard to internal management of affairs in the Department of the Interior, unless they be vital. I do not agree with the present Secretary in some of his policies of so-called conservation, and yet I believe in conservation and he believes in conservation. I can kick as hard as anybody if and when he becomes too autocratic and overdoes even a good thing, such as national parks and monuments, and on that issue I have had it 'round and 'round with him. But let us not quarrel now over a matter of \$1,000 in salary for an important administrative official. The Secretary himself is not getting one-tenth as much annual salary as is paid to most business executives handling concerns with far less value and importance. Let us pass this bill and give the Secretary this help.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill on its merits. I am particularly glad to support legislation that contains this provision:

That there shall be in the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, or may be required by law.

If there is anything we need in any of these departments to bring about better cooperation between the Congress and the departments it is to have men appointed subject to confirmation by that branch of the Congress which has that power under the Constitution of the United States. I wish more of the policy-forming positions in the departments could be filled under that provision. If there is anything that in my 10 years of experience and trying to represent the people of the great western part of the country—and 72 percent of my State is Federally owned—I have found needed it is men who are responsive to and under the control of the Congress. I have found that where we have men in the departments who are appointed subject to confirmation by the Senate, they are far more cooperative and have far more respect for the Congress and the wishes of the people than where the men are appointed not subject to such confirmation.

We are talking here about \$9,000 a year. It would be very easy for the Secretary of the Interior to appoint two men at \$4,500 a year who would flout the Congress and be independent and arrogant, as so many of them are in the departments.

If there is anything from which the people of the United States are suffering,

anything they want to get out from under, it is bureaucratic control. I am glad that this position is to be filled along constitutional lines, the appointment being subject to confirmation by the Senate. For that reason, I am for the bill 100 percent.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, or may be required by law. The Assistant Secretaries of the Interior shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of \$9,000 per annum. The additional position created by this act shall exist only during the present war and for 6 months thereafter.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of the bill after the period in line 10 on page 1 and insert the following: "The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation or by the Congress by concurrent resolution."

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for 15 minutes.

AMERICA'S WAR EFFORT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have watched America's war machine grow into a powerful striking force, prepared to meet our enemies on any ground. Today the war is being carried to our foes, and on many fronts the flag goes proudly forward. Our people are confident and rightfully so. There is good cause for confidence.

America is fulfilling its promise of production. It has become truly the arsenal and the granary of the United Nations. Farm production in 1943 topped even the great record of 1942 by 5 percent. Both years were far above pre-war averages and 50 percent above World War No. 1 production a superhuman accomplishment despite shortages of farm labor, machinery, and fertilizer.

There is much satisfaction in the fact that 8,798 planes were produced in January 1944. It means that a new plane came down the assembly lines every 5 minutes.

American shipyards delivered to the merchant marine 208 ships in December 1943. There were only 99 in the entire year of 1941. In 1942 the number of

ships delivered was 746, but in 1943, deliveries totaled 1,896 ships which grossed over 19,000,000 dead-weight tons. I take pride in the fact that Wainwright yard at Panama City in my district has probably the outstanding production record in the Southeast and that the Pensacola shipyard is forging rapidly to the front with its facilities in full production.

On the military side of the picture, we find that the United States Army is 60 times as large as in pre-war days, and that increased fire power and mobility give it a striking power 100 times greater. We have thrown everything into a race to complete this Army in time to strike hardest in the decisive stage of the war. Now, that race is won. The Army is close to its planned strength of 7,700,000. One-third of it is overseas, another third is going over this year. With increased shipping and more trained replacements, many battle-weary veterans will get deserved furloughs back home during this year.

The Navy's growth has been even more spectacular. In 1941, the Navy had 2,136 ships of all types. In 1942, this number grew to 6,759. But in 1943 the number of Navy ships increased to 26,326, and the number estimated for the end of 1944 is 41,179. No wonder Tojo does not sleep well any more.

It is encouraging to us in the Third District to realize that we have contributed greatly to both the Army and Navy training programs. One base in particular enjoys a Nation-wide reputation and strategic importance second to none. It is the great Naval Air Training Center at Pensacola. With a personnel of approximately 20,000, it brings into the area more than \$50,000,000 annually.

Yet in the national picture the great production records of our people and our war plants and the success of our fighting men have led to a let-down in effort, to a little premature celebrating. And the fact that there is cause for celebration makes it natural that some of our people should become overconfident and complacent.

Very recently, responsible officials have warned that some Americans are forgetting there is a war on. But they are not only warning against overconfidence and complacency. They see something more sinister. They are noting that groups and individuals—an industrial minority, some farm-bloc leaders, a few union-labor chieftains, and some politicians—are beginning to pull out of the war effort and to advance their own special interests, heedless of the Nation's interests.

Tarawa and the Anzio-Nettuno beach-head—the miles that separate our forces from Tokyo and the uncracked might of Hitler's European fortress—should carry their own warning against overconfidence, complacency, selfishness, and politics as usual. The war is not yet won. It will be won, but the toughest fighting still lies ahead. Many, many thousands of American boys are yet to die in bitterest combat. How many of them must die will depend in part upon the job that each of us does on the home front.

I cannot say too much for the glorious achievements of America's fighting men. I am proud to point to the records of men like Maj. Gen. Roy Geiger, who is leading our victorious marines in the South Pacific. I think of lovable, hard-working Commander Jack Shoemaker, of gallant Maj. Walter Beckham, who with 18 Nazi planes shot down, is ace of aces among American airmen over Europe; of Corp. Charles Dawson, who was at Guadalcanal and who followed the magnificent Carlson at Makin Island; of Lt. Johnny Courtney, who made 66 successful fighter missions against the Nazis; of Capt. Albert M. Lewis, who refused to quit when his feet were crushed by a land mine in north Africa. These brave Floridians are but six of thousands whose achievements I could list. And I could turn to the scroll of sorrow, to the rolls of our heroic dead, for the names of other Floridians whose great sacrifice we must be doubly sure has not been made in vain. Those they left behind already know the full tragedy of war.

The little sacrifices, the minor discomforts that we are called on to bear at home are of small consequence indeed compared to theirs. That is why I have watched with concern the signs of dissatisfaction and disunity—the emphasis which some are placing on personal rather than national interest.

There are a few, and thank God they are few, who feel that we should be able to engage in the greatest war of all time, equip and prepare ten to twelve million fighting men, and send most of them abroad without serious dislocations at home. They expect great profits, high wages, low prices, no shortages, and the minimum of suffering and hardship. There are those among us who expect to wipe away a tear with one hand for those who have gone down in glory and grab for everything they can with the other. Fortunately the great number of our people know that democracy means a willingness to share what privation the war brings. To them we must look for a renewed determination to maintain a successful home front.

There are legitimate home-front differences. There are home-front weaknesses which can and should be corrected by our Government. This I have argued time and again. I have frequently been concerned by official muddling which is completely out of place in war. There are too many complicated regulations. Funds are being expended unnecessarily. There are too many Government employees. I resent interference in the constitutional rights of my State by Federal officials. And I resent activity by any person which leads to racial and class discord. But, like most people, I do not object to sacrifices, and I am glad to pull in harness with our leadership to help win the war at the earliest possible moment. I know that lack of faith in our democratic government and lack of confidence in its world leadership cause disunity, and disunity can lead only to distress, suffering, and hardship. It can make the war last longer, and by making the war last

longer, disunity kills American boys who otherwise would live to come back.

The President has correctly said:

In our military planning, in our production planning, and in our financial planning we cannot rely with safety on hopes of early victory.

We must realize that, as the world becomes war weary, our tasks and our burdens will become heavier. But a successful home front will be no less essential to victory. We must steel ourselves not to lose sight of the real objectives. Knowing that hard work and cooperation can solve every home-front problem, knowing that we cannot afford to fail, the men on the fighting fronts, let us all—farmers, ship workers, bankers, grocers, and all the others—rededicate ourselves to an untiring effort to win the war and then to win the peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. ROBERTSON), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1447. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution and a bill of the House of the following titles:

On February 9, 1944:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944.

On February 10, 1944:

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The hearings on H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, will be continued on Friday, February 11, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Monday, February 14, 1944, to consider H. R. 1688, a bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, also the companion bill, S. 275, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will have a meeting on Monday, February 14, 1944, at 10:30 a. m. Jesse Jones will testify on the bill H. R. 3873, introduced by Mr. PATMAN.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume public hearings on House Resolution 418 and House Resolution 419, relative to the Jewish national home in Palestine, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 15, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Friday, February 11: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, including Salt River, Taylorsville, Ky., the Potomac River and tributaries, the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimack Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, and the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

2. Tuesday, February 15: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Gen. M. C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission and division engineer, and proponents and opponents of projects along the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Red and Arkansas Rivers, Conway County, Ark., and Purgatoire (Picket Wire) River, Colo., the White, St. Francis, and Yazoo Rivers.

3. Wednesday, February 16: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Col. Miles Reber, former division engineer, Missouri River division, Omaha, Nebr., and proponents and opponents of projects along the Missouri River and tributaries.

4. Thursday, February 17: Continuation of the projects discussed on February 16.

5. Friday, February 18: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in other regions in the United States.

6. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

7. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1171. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated August 21, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1172. A letter from Mr. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, transmitting the Annual Report of the Navy Club of the United States of America, for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1173. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Thirty-first Annual Report of the Secretary of Labor for fiscal year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Labor.

1174. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the ninth annual report, which covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and certain major developments up to January 1, 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1175. A letter from the Director, Office of War Information, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Information covering the third quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1176. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting copies of the information furnished the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of making a determination of the Veterans' Administration personnel requirements for the third quarter of the 1944 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1177. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

1178. A letter from the Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, United States Department of Labor, transmitting the report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the United States Department of Labor for the year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Labor.

1179. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$150,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 413); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1180. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, relating to travel allowances; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1181. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize Army officers designated by the Secretary of War to take final action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property," approved October 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 758); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1182. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of \$34,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for the War Department for cemetery expenses (H. Doc. No. 414); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1183. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Foreign Economic Administration, designed to authorize expenditures necessary to return dependents of employees of the Foreign Economic Administration and the State Department who were moved to foreign posts of duty at Government expense (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1184. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 in the sum of \$172,146,860, together with proposed provisions, in the form of amendments to the Budget for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944 affecting appropriations for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1185. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, for various constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency, also quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the same period for Office of the Administrator; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1186. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period December 1, 1943, through January 31, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1187. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting copies of the requests for personnel needs during the third quarter of fiscal 1944 as placed before the Bureau of the Budget on January 1; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1188. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a supplement to the report entitled "Distribution Methods and Costs, Part I—Important Food Products," submitted on November 11, 1943; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1189. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the financial statement of the Bonneville administrator for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, made under the provisions of section 9 (c) of the Bonneville Act (Public, No. 329, 75th Cong., approved August 20, 1937); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 346. Resolution providing for an investigation of the program for the planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 433. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4103, a bill to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances; without amendment (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 434. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3209, a bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1115). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 230. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 203 of the Criminal Code, and sections 306, 314, and 315 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; with amendment (Rept. No. 1117). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:
H. R. 4162. A bill to provide for emergency disability compensation for members of the land, naval, or air forces separated from service, pending settlement of their claims by veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BLAND:
H. R. 4163. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO:
H. R. 4164. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HINSHAW:
H. R. 4165. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:
H. R. 4166. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:
H. R. 4167. A bill to provide for a 20-percent increase for the duration of the war in the amount of the Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and in the amount of Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4168. A bill to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4169. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 4170. A bill to supplement the Federal-aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the establishment of an interregional system of highways, and to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed highway facilities in the locations where such facilities are most urgently required and where the conversion from war to peacetime activities will require the cushioning effects of public-works construction; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 435. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Fourth Intermediate Report (H. Rept. No. 1024) of the Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies for the use of the committee; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 436. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the House of Representatives with information relative to the benefits to be derived by the United States from the construction of the proposed Persian pipe line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the deportation of alien and inimical Japanese at the conclusion of the present war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4171. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4172. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T. H.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4173. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4174. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4808. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Passaic County Central Labor Union (Ameri-

can Federation of Labor), Paterson, N. J., protesting against the enactment of a national service law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4809. By Mr. CLASON: Resolution adopted by members of the Springfield (Mass.) Zionist District and affiliated organizations on January 31, 1944, favoring the adoption by the Congress of House Resolution 419, and urging the State Department to use its influence with the British Government to take such steps as are necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the aforesaid resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4810. By Mr. CROSSER: Petition of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the Russian invasion and her claims to half of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4811. By Mr. GAVIN: Petition of the Brockway Orient Club and other citizens of Brockway, Pa., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 or similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4812. Also, petition of G. T. Doyle and 5,000 other residents of the Twentieth Pennsylvania District and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4813. Also, petition of 2,360 residents of the Twentieth Pennsylvania District and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 or similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4814. Also, petition of 1,140 citizens of Twentieth Pennsylvania District and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 or similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4815. By Mr. GILLETTE: Petition of residents of the Fifteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4816. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 9,830 residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) or any similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4817. By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON: Petition of Fillmore C. Marks and others, urging the abrogation of Great Britain's White Paper to allow the persecuted Jews of Europe to go to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4818. By Mr. MERROW: Petition signed by 21 residents of Berlin, N. H., appealing for appropriate action to insure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine White Paper of May 1939, and urging that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration, and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth, to the end that the Jewish people may be enabled to take its rightful place in the progressive order of mankind; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4819. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Russell J. Baumann and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4820. Also, petition of William P. Birtley and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4821. Also, petition of H. H. Danglos and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4822. Also, petition of Clara C. Lieber and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4823. Also, petition of Evan J. Van Hook and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all pro-

hibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4824. Also, petition of Fred J. Hahn and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4825. Also, petition of Ira L. Bretzfelder and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4826. Also, petition of J. M. Alvey and 11 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4827. Also, petition of Thomas E. Creley and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4828. Also, petition of Oliver C. Ludwig and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4829. Also, petition of Angelo C. Mamati and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4830. Also, petition of John Sknski and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4831. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of 691 citizens of Philadelphia, opposing the Bryson prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4832. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Pile Drivers, Bridge, Wharf, and Dock Builders, Local Union, No. 34, opposing the House bill 3477; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4833. Also, resolution of the International Association of Machinists, Lodge 68, San Francisco, Calif., relative to a Federal ballot for all those in the armed forces; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4834. Also, resolution of the Pile Drivers, Bridge, Wharf and Dock Builders, Local Union No. 34, San Francisco, Calif., relative to memorializing Congress on the soldiers' vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4835. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of John Jasinski, president, Circuit 36 of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, representing a membership of 2,500, comprising Brooke, Hancock, Marshall, and Ohio Counties, W. Va., urging the State Department to favor and foster the cause of a righteous adjustment of the integrity of the former pre-war boundaries of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4836. By Mr. WEISS: Petition of 2,140 petitioners of the Thirtieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4837. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the acting city manager, city of Gladstone, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a veterans' hospital and rehabilitation center in the city of Gladstone; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4838. Also, petition of the executive director, the Philadelphia Council of the American Jewish Congress, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging enactment of House Resolutions 418 and 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.